

MARRIAGE AND FREEDOM

NAWAB SALAR JUNG BAHADUR,

By the same author:

LOVE WITHOUT FEAR, a plain guide to sex technique for every adult.

SLIMMING FOR THE MILLION, a practical handbook for patients and practitioners.

Jointly with Zoë Dawe:

THE PRACTICE OF SEX EDUCATION, a guide for teachers, parents, and youth group leaders.

MARRIAGE AND FREEDOM

by

Dr. EUSTACE CHESSER

*The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves.*

SHAKESPEARE.



RICH & COWAN MEDICAL PUBLICATIONS
LONDON : NEW YORK : MELBOURNE : SYDNEY

THIS BOOK IS PRODUCED IN
COMPLETE CONFORMITY WITH THE
AUTHORIZED ECONOMY STANDARDS.

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT
THE FLEET STREET PRESS
EAST HARDING STREET, E.C.4

For
RIEHL & COWAN
Eclipse Press Service Ltd.
London, W.C.2

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
<p>I FREE MARRIAGE AS AN IDEAL</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">An introductory chapter in which the field covered by this book is briefly surveyed—Chains which bind many marriages—Economic factors—The wife's legal status—Romantic infantilism—Sacrifice as a fetish—What Free Marriage means.</p>	9
<p>II THE ROMANTIC DELUSION</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">People who marry a bank balance—Love at first sight—Need for a flesh-and-blood partner—Falling in and out of love—The dangers of infatuation—Giving the intellect as well as the heart a chance.</p>	15
<p>III ADAPTATION TO LIFE</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Facing the facts in marriage—Retreat from Reality—Day-dreamers, and why—Two kinds of magic—How neurotics shift responsibility—Misunderstood Gods and discouraged worms—Complete "normality" an ideal state—Total personality—Hope for the neurotic—Steps towards adaptation to life.</p>	20
<p>IV CHARACTER TYPES</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Temperaments which clash—Types of human beings—Four temperamental groups—Jung's character classes—Introverts and extraverts—Some common types discussed—The "logic of feeling"—The problem of temperamental adjustment.</p>	26
<p>V THE PERSONAL FACTOR IN MARRIAGE</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Not finding "Mr. or Miss Right," but <i>being</i> the right person—Disraeli's marriage examined—Thirty years of married happiness based on companionship—Security, the best one-word reason for marriage—Emotional immaturity and its dangers—Love as an end, not as the starting-point—The married lover's responsibility—Infantile sexuality—The truth about repression—Psycho-analysis and sex freedom—Questions which aid self-knowledge—Steps towards personal adjustment in marriage.</p>	31
<p>VI THE WIFE-HUSBAND RELATIONSHIP (PART ONE)</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Women and the sex impulse—What should regulate the love-relationship?—The wife who "submits"—Need for co-operation on every level—Ridding the sex relationship of false shame—The wife's mental attitude—Inferiority feelings and their origin—Sex expression on the whole range of shared activities.</p>	39
<p>VII THE WIFE-HUSBAND RELATIONSHIP (PART TWO)</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">The technique of love-making—Must embrace more than the physical relationship—Difficulties of husband-wife adjustment—Understanding a woman's emotional mechanism—Women instinctively intuitive, men rational—What wives hope for in marriage—Calling forth a wife's responses.</p>	48
<p>VIII WOMAN'S CLAIM TO SEX EQUALITY</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">"The right to joy"—Problem of the "surplus" women—Married women who experience no erotic pleasure—What "rights" has a wife in the realm of sex?—The experience of the majority profoundly unsatisfactory—The "Economic" Woman's challenge—</p>	53

Men and women not alike—How the double standard arose—The snare of "complete sexual equality"—Has promiscuity brought men happiness?—The right of every woman to recognition that her sex needs are different from those of a man.

IX THE "FREE LOVE" FALLACY 62

Nothing new in the idea of free love—Rebels against convention who cannot help themselves—Giving a trial to "trial marriage"—Two against the world—Experimentalists who demand certainty when there can be no certainty—Why trial marriage appeals to the emotionally immature—Love-speculators and the curve of happiness.

X COMPANIONATE MARRIAGE 67

Judge Ben Lindsey's proposals—The "House of Human Welfare"—Does he support free love?—Bureaucratic interference in intimate relations—The apostle of "flaming Youth"—Companionate Marriage and Free Marriage compared.

XI MOTHER RUSSIA AND HER FAMILY 71

Russia's experiments in the sphere of sex and marriage—A sweeping change in Soviet policy—The new Marriage Code—Compulsion in the marriage field—Subordinating all else to increase of population—State interference on the Russian model compared with Companionate Marriage and Free Marriage.

XII THE CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCHES 75

A magistrate draws attention to a revolting application of "Christian" ethics—The "hero" who killed his wife for self-satisfaction—Dean Inge's view—Harm done by certain religious "morality" groups—The challenge of the "New Morality"—A number of different moral standards, not one—What is "The Moral Conscience"?—Changing values—Psycho-analysis and religion—No such thing as religious mania—The great opportunity for the churches—Signs of new life in the church.

XIII THE CLERGY AS CONSULTANTS AND ADVISERS 87

Preparation for marriage—Where the Parson can obtain help regarding sex education—Psychology and the work of the Parish Priest—Various methods of Christian sex education—Pastoral visitation, church organisations and the pulpit message—Linking church and home—Applied Christianity and the secular movement for sex education.

XIV THE "INTERMEDIATE SEX" 92

No single human being entirely masculine or entirely feminine—"He-women" and "She-men" victims of circumstances—How sex development should proceed—Bisexuality and homosexuality—Influence of mother's love upon the child's development—Learning correct sex attitudes—How "fixations" occur—Arrested development or retarded growth—Deviations of the basic sex urge and how they arise—"Substitution" for normal sex expression—When one part of the mind refuses to grow up—What produces "conflicts"?—What should be our attitude to homosexuals?—Married people and friendships with persons of their own sex.

XV	OVERTHROWING SEX DICTATORSHIP	105
	What is sexual freedom?—Complete freedom of sexual expression impossible without freedom within—The Dark Dictator who resides within ourselves—Can we get to grips with this tyrant?—How knowledge can help us towards freedom within—Making the Super-ego our friend—"The truth shall make you free!"	
XVI	SEX SUBLIMATION	111
	Mistaken views about sublimation—Cannot be achieved at will—Its implications for parents and educators—The part of religion.	
XVII	FAMILY FINANCE	114
	The economic position of the married woman—Complete dependence upon the husband—Family disagreements about money—The right attitude to family finance—Managing money instead of being managed by it.	
XVIII	MARRIAGES OF CONVENIENCE	119
	Marrying the right "background"—Marriage bureaux and their clients—Feelings of inferiority and fear of rebuff—Parent-arranged marriages—The Jewish marriage—Mr. Claud Mullins praises Jewish standards—Advantages of the realistic approach to marriage.	
XIX	THE BREAK-UP VALUE OF A MARRIAGE	123
	The defeatist attitude towards marriage—Importance of starting with confident outlook—"Look before you leap"—The price of freedom—Grounds for divorce and grounds for an effort at re-adjustment.	
XX	PREPARING THE CHILD FOR FREE MARRIAGE	129
	Official recognition of the need for sex education in the schools—The Board of Education takes action—Sex as a school subject—Sex as a part of life, not merely as a branch of knowledge—Where sex education inevitably begins—Emotional starvation of the child—The task of the teacher—Home and school must work together.	
XXI	HOW TO TELL A CHILD THE FACTS	134
	The need to tell children the truth—answering the child's questions—The right manner essential to good results—Guidance in actual wording of suitable answers—The parent who looks ahead.	
XXII	THE FAMILY AS A SOCIAL UNIT	140
	Families can be scattered, but not really "broken up"—Should bureaucrats replace parents?—Threat of a Whipsnade World—Emotional results of enforced mobility of labour—Houses or homes?—"Human Budgets" may mislead—The family as the true social unit.	
XXIII	GROW OLD GRATEFULLY!	144
	The design for old age fashioned well in advance—How this design is made during middle life—Insuring against boredom—Reviewing the past—How parents project part of their lives on to their children—Love <i>the end</i> , not the beginning.	

PREFACE

The publication of a frank and clearly-worded volume entitled *Love Without Fear*, in which I sought to impart information regarding the technique of love, resulted in a considerable amount of misunderstanding. The book was devoted mainly, but not entirely, to the sex part of the love-relationship, and perhaps not unnaturally some have drawn the conclusion that I regard the sex factor as the beginning, middle and end of love.

In the present book I have sought to deal with love in its most comprehensive aspect, dealing with sex as one function of the human personality, and its direct expression as but a part of marriage.

I find, on reading the complete volume, a measure of direct address to the reader such as is unusual in books. The reason for this is that some of the chapters are based on talks to teachers, youth groups and other organisations, and I have retained the direct and simple form of expression which experience has convinced me is desirable in dealing with marriage and its problems in order to avoid misunderstanding.

I am indebted to various authors for ideas and extracts, and to these I have referred in the book.

Marriage is under fire from many quarters at the present time. In its main features it is not seriously threatened. But I have noted a marked tendency, not among the working class, but in what are often styled the middle and upper classes, for people to enter it in a very experimental frame of mind. "Let us see how it turns out" has largely replaced the idea of life-long union. It is because I believe that I have something to say to those who think thus, something which merits their careful attention, that I present these talks for the consideration of a wider audience.

EUSTACE CHESSER.

*Upper Brook Street,
W.I.*

CHAPTER I

FREE MARRIAGE AS AN IDEAL

WE have heard much about free love in recent years. We have also heard a great deal about freer divorce, by which is meant, presumably, easier and cheaper divorce. But nobody seems to have thought of starting a campaign in favour of free marriage. Why not?

The free marriage is the happy marriage. Of that there can be not the shadow of a doubt. All the factors which make for marital misery are chains of one kind or another. Some of these are economic, some legal. But most of them are personal. For every marriage which fails because of economic factors or because of legal provisions which press heavily upon one or the other of the partners, at least a score are wrecked by the personal inadequacies of the parties to the marriage.

There are many happy marriages in the poorest sections of the community. Even so, it is undeniable that inadequate family income accounts for a vast amount of friction and unhappiness. The constant struggle to make ends meet will wear down the nerves of the wife. The continual fight against odds, year in, year out, will break the spirit of many a man. With nerves worn down and spirit broken one of the partners becomes "impossible to live with."

To the social investigator poverty is mainly a matter of inadequate shelter, food, and clothing. To the economist, it is the relation a particular income bears to the cost of living at any specific date. But to us, concerned about marriage, it is most emphatically one of the chains which must be torn away if free marriage is to be realised. For poverty binds families down, strains the whole atmosphere of the home, and often makes the friendly relationship which should exist impossible.

But that is only the simplest illustration of how economic factors affect marriage. There are others which are not so immediately obvious. For instance, the dependent position of the wife in the majority of homes is an economic factor which unquestionably tends to mar marriage. I have known wives of wealthy men who never have a penny they can call their own. True, their larger needs—dress and the like—are always promptly met from the husband's bank balance. But they cannot spend apart from their husbands. They cannot indulge in little luxuries or entertain their friends on the spur of the moment. They are completely dependent. They are tied tightly to their husband's purse-strings. They are not free.

Sometimes, too, the position of economic dependence is occupied by the husband. He may not be dependent upon his wife for every penny he needs. But because of poorly paid employment, he may have to take second place as family bread-winner to his wife who goes out to work.

"Why shouldn't men sometimes play second fiddle to their wives in this respect?" I have sometimes been asked by women who are mindful, *very* mindful, of the opportunities which increasingly are open to women in

business and the professions. But the strict rights or wrongs of the matter are not the point at issue. It may be a good thing that women should outshine and out-earn their husbands in fields outside of the home, just as it *may* be a good thing for husbands to be better cooks, child nurses, or needle-workers than their wives.

But it is with the severely practical aspect that I am concerned. And it is undeniable that, as a general rule, the man who cannot afford to keep his wife and family decently, but who has to play a minor rôle while his wife earns the greater part of the family income, suffers agonies of mind. The wife, too, however kindly disposed she may be towards her husband, is almost certain at some time or other, in the course of an argument, to ask, "After all, if it were not for what I earn, where should we all be?"

These are only three illustrations of how economic conditions affect marriage. Scores of others could be cited. The fear of having children, or more children, lies at the roots of many marital difficulties, and springs largely—perhaps mainly—from the feeling that adequate financial provision for any addition to the family is not available.

Statesmen and economists must solve the economic problems which affect marriage. My purpose here is merely to draw attention to the fact that many economic problems affect marriage to some degree. Every step taken towards economic security for the masses of our people, provided that it does not undermine the essential family relationship, is a move in the direction of the free marriage.

There has been much discussion in recent years regarding the legal position of the wife. The state of economic dependence, which is the lot—or little!—of the majority of wives, has legal sanction. The law definitely treats the wife as a being inferior to her husband. When a wife contrives, by careful management, to save a little regularly out of her housekeeping allowance, she may be ordered by the Court to hand the proceeds back to her husband. In fact, unless she goes out to work, she may not regard any part of the family income as her very own—not as a right, anyway. Her husband may, as many husbands do, take steps to provide her with some portion of the family income which she can spend as she chooses. But there is no compulsion upon him to do so.

With this problem, as it affects many marriages, I shall deal in a later chapter. Here it is mentioned merely as an example of the manner in which the law tends to favour one sex at the expense of the other, and sometimes presses unduly heavily upon the wife.

But it is with the personal aspects that I am chiefly concerned. The biggest barriers to the free marriages are not imposed from without, but from within. If we are not free, we must carry into marriage the chains which bind us. Whilst many of them derive from individual circumstances, others are forged by society in general.

No one would think of disputing that marriage essentially is for adults. And we shall see later that many marriages fail because one or both of the partners, whilst of adult years, are nevertheless infantile emotionally. Such persons are held back at almost every stage by the chains of a romantic infantilism.

The book, *Love Without Fear*, resulted in a case at the Old Bailey. As I listened to the evidence I looked very carefully at the jury and wondered how they stood in this important respect. Were those men and women grown

up emotionally? Were they persons capable of treating sex as a perfectly natural thing, or was it, to them, something "sordid"? Did they believe that any man who dared to write plainly upon sex must be depraved, and that the right course for us all to adopt was to act for all the world as though sex did not exist?

They were obviously intelligent persons, genuinely interested in all the evidence, keenly following every point. Yet there are millions of emotional babies walking this earth—grown men and women who lose all sense of proportion where sex is concerned. Outwardly, they are like other adults. And it flashed through my mind that, in spite of the excellent summing-up of the judge, almost everything depended upon the fundamental outlook of the jury. I realised, moreover, that whatever verdict they agreed upon, there could easily be collected elsewhere another twelve who would almost certainly bring in a different one. It all depended upon whether, to them, sex was something to be openly discussed, or whether it was something unfit to be mentioned.

I should like to have been able to explain, in detail, there in Court, precisely why only people who are emotionally mature can hope to make a success of marriage. I should like to have explained why it is that we have such large numbers of emotional babies entering the married state—persons who, while physically mature, are infantile in their outlook and emotional make-up.

To stand up and maintain that, in these days, when we hear so much about the freedom with which sex is discussed, men and women are often incapable of treating the subject rationally, might well have seemed absurd to almost all who were present in the Court. Yet the plain fact is that a large number of generally intelligent people cannot treat sex as a normal subject for discussion at all. They get angry about it, or they flush up and feel thoroughly awkward. Even though they admit that sex exists and is important in all our lives, at the back of their minds there is a lingering doubt as to whether it is quite "nice" to breathe a word about it.

Many of them realise that this attitude is foolish. But they feel that they cannot emancipate themselves from it. What produces this reaction to anything to do with sex?

The truth is, that in spite of the interest now taken in the subject of sex education, for both children and adults, we go on developing and encouraging infantile traits in a thousand ways. We know that sex is part of all our lives. We know that none can escape it. We know that to try to escape from it is harmful. Yet the basic idea behind efforts to ban serious books dealing with sex represents part of this infantile make-believe. The idea that grown-up men and women cannot safely read a book explaining the more "intimate" aspects of sex is still prevalent.

It can be expressed like this: "If we pretend that sex is not there, it will not be there."

It is, indeed, as though there were a vast conspiracy to prevent people from growing up. The cancer of romantic infantilism has eaten very deeply into our modern life, so that—even while we congratulate ourselves upon the new outlook regarding sex, plan to increase sex guidance in our schools, and generally admit, if a little grudgingly, that sex is there and is not to be ignored—at least nine out of ten adults still go through life displaying utterly child-like traits.

Nine out of ten adults dream their way along, expecting at any moment to find a soul-mate appearing, on direct instructions from heaven, to greet them and live happily with them ever after!

Mothers murder their children's emotions in the most deadly manner. They seek at all costs to prevent the chill realities of life from touching them. For this purpose they use wad after wad of emotional cotton-wool. "Some day my prince will come!" Santa Claus will pop out of the grate and bring the precious gift of love!

Girls who have been moulded to believe this romantic rubbish sometimes acquire the habit of sitting for hours on end—dreaming of the wondrous creature who will "come into their lives" some day. They read novels and novelettes which confirm these absurd, childish fancies. They see films in which "it all comes right in the end," without any conscious, deliberate, brave effort on anybody's part. If you want to write a story for a popular magazine read by the masses, rule one is: Have a happy ending.

Alas, life is not at all like that. Those who realise this truth will be the happier for the knowledge!

Prince Charming holds many married women in bondage. They compare their very human, and therefore ordinary, husbands, with the dream-figure of the handsome prince, and feel badly let down. Why is not the husband all that the good prince has been for so many years? Why is not this husband of reality as perfect as the dream-picture?

Men are sometimes enslaved by a Fairy Princess in precisely the same way. The romantic approach to love and marriage, drilled into them by a score of agencies, ranging from home influence to the B.B.C., and, to some extent, fostered by the law of the land, causes them to regard women as superior creatures just a little higher than the angels. And there is one from among this host of perfect creatures who, one day, will deign to wed the poor dreamer. Thenceforth he will serve her with all his being, and nothing will come between them and all will be lovely, both in the garden and in the house!

These slaves of fairy creatures, of dream-creations, having been brought up to believe in the magical kind of love, very easily become slaves of love. They really do fall in love with *love*. They fall in and they fall out with unfailing regularity. Always they find that their affections have been misplaced. Never does the object of the temporary affection prove "worthy" of it.

The truth is, of course, that they are quite incapable of loving any one individual for long, since they are really in love with the *idea* of love—yes, and a totally erroneous idea of love at that!

It is these emotional infants who sigh as they declare that love is *everything*. It most emphatically is not.

It is the motive-power which drives the machinery of the married relationship. It is the incentive of all that is best in marriage—the driving-force which keeps the partners striving when they have to surmount obstacles, or when, with aching hearts and set teeth, they have to fight a terrific battle. Love is not the end of any road. At best it is the start of a long road.

The romantic idealists who talk about marriages being "made in heaven" refuse to learn from what they see around them. Almost every adult knows of cases in which people have married while they were very obviously "in love," only to become frankly bored with each other after a time, possibly a very short time. They may even have grown to hate the very sight of each other! Grim

proofs of the romantic fallacy abound on every hand. But old ideas—especially unsound ones!—die hard.

While there is still a considerable amount of risk in attempting to furnish in print clear information on the subject of sex and marriage which the least-educated can understand—information which is clearly necessary to the well-being of all adults who marry or contemplate marriage—the most dangerous drive is not merely permitted, but actually encouraged.

Books and plays which feature the “marriages made in heaven” legend are generally regarded, and indeed are sometimes actually described, as being of “high tone.” Girls are told again and again in books, plays, lectures, sermons, and by implication in a host of other ways, that their salvation in life lies in getting married and in “making a home.” Only slowly is the need for preparation, preliminary training, being recognised. On the whole, the attitude still is that sooner or later “Love will knock at the door of your heart.”

It is no exaggeration to say that the overwhelming majority of girls are still brought up to look forward to one great experience, something which above all else is to be looked for, expected, eagerly welcomed. It is *falling in love*. Boys usually have much less to say on the subject than girls. Even so, they, too, are led to believe that their problem of the choice of a partner in marriage will conveniently solve itself.

They will “fall” for somebody. Falling involves a drop. And, with love, those who fall hardest are likely to be the most hurt, humbled, and lowered, both in their own and their friends’ estimation.

At this stage some may wonder whether I am not tilting a lance against love. Not at all. If we give love its due, we shall give love much, in all truth. But love alone does not make a marriage happy. It is the basis of the happy marriage, but *love-plus* is the genuine recipe, love plus a number of things which vary according to circumstances and to the make-up and aspirations of the partners. One essential quality, linked with love, must always be common sense, which is not nearly so common as its name implies.

If love alone were enough—love unguided by common sense and unaided by reasonable competence in the ordinary affairs of life—many a marriage which I have known to fail would have proved an outstanding success. One extreme case I recall concerned two persons whose love for each other was intense. Each felt a consuming urge to give; their love assumed a sacrificial quality which, within reason, would have been touching and beautiful.

But it was not kept within reason. Astonishing extremes of sacrifice by each partner soon resulted in misery for both of them. There was a veritable competition to be the better doormat! Each feared what the other would do next. Neither could bear to participate in any enjoyable activity without the other. A deep-rooted conviction, which had its beginning in early religious training, that genuine love must inevitably be linked with extreme sacrifice dogged both their lives and, eventually, ruined their marriage.

This, I grant, is an exceptional case. But it illustrates the truth that love alone is not sufficient. I choose it as an example because in such circumstances it is immediately obvious that the results must be bad. I could cite many other instances far less extreme than this, and at first consideration far less obvious in their effects.

We can hardly over-estimate the importance of love. Yet we can quite easily create a totally wrong impression as to what love is, and what is its place in

the happy marriage. That, indeed, is precisely what is being done. We tend to put tremendous emphasis upon the importance of being in love. Yet we should help our young people more by insisting that being "in love" and loving somebody are not by any means the same. It is a fact that those who marry in the throes of infatuation run the gravest risks of marital unhappiness.

Now it is clear that success in marriage depends to a large extent not upon what kind of partner we choose, nor upon the general conditions of our marriage, but upon the sort of persons we are. An unhappy marriage is not the result of a decision made by a committee presided over by the Evil One in the nether regions, any more than a happy marriage is one bearing the mark : Made in heaven.

Point to any unhappy marriage, and what do you find above all else? Two persons, two ordinary human beings, who cannot co-operate fully and effectively in something to which they should attach great importance and in which it is very much to their interest to succeed.

Now suppose that our parents, preachers and writers all started to tell young people that happiness and true success in life depended upon their ability to build an aeroplane which could fly twice round the world. Suppose, too, that at the same time they tried to banish all books which explained clearly and simply all that was known of aeronautical science, and indeed anything likely to prepare them for the task of aircraft building. The whole thing would be absurd, would it not?

Yet it is still customary in many quarters to adopt an attitude which is quite as absurd as this so far as preparing young people for love and marriage is concerned. How many husbands and wives of to-day were given the slightest teaching or preparation on how to be a good husband or wife? How many young people who contemplate marriage have been guided into the ability to be expert lovers?

There is a most important movement, which is making great progress, in favour of sex education in schools and among youth organisations, as we shall see later. But this invaluable work is being hampered all over the country because so few persons feel capable of talking frankly to young people about sex. This reluctance does not arise from a failure to appreciate the importance of the matter, nor is it due to lack of knowledge of the subject, which could easily be acquired. It is due to a deep-rooted feeling of fear. Large numbers of teachers of both sexes feel that they cannot bring themselves to talk about sex, although they admit the need for sex instruction.

They are not free within themselves. It is not their fault, since it is due to centuries of false teaching and to the "hush-hush" attitude towards sex which whilst generally discredited nowadays, nevertheless has affected us all to some degree.

In the sphere of marriage it is vitally necessary that there should be no feeling in either of the partners that there is anything unpleasant about sex. But we have to face the fact that thousands of married people are robbed of much of the enjoyment which the married relationship should bring because they are not free within themselves. They are victims to false attitudes which the past has instilled and developed within them.

The ideal of free marriage is the coming together of two persons, emotionally mature, to share their lives and to unite for mutual enrichment in the closest possible manner open to human beings. There must be a basis of

equality, and each must contribute towards the common weal. Thus, the ideal marriage is an ideal community in miniature.

The partners in this free marriage must themselves be free—free from the fears which spring from within. It is not an ideal which can be fully realised in a short time, for centuries of misunderstanding and a conspiracy of silence on sex matters have left us all affected, to some extent, so that we are not able to treat sex as the natural thing it is. But Free Marriage as an ideal is worthy of constant effort, for through it alone can men and women attain their highest good.

CHAPTER II

THE ROMANTIC DELUSION

THOUSANDS of people enter the married state without really marrying a person at all. Some marry a bank balance. Others marry a house which appeals to them, and accept the owner of the house as something "thrown in" with their real bargain. A vast number of people marry someone who does not exist save in their own imagination. Yet the first essential to happiness in marriage is that one should marry somebody—a real person.

Those who marry a bank balance, that and nothing more, participate in a "marriage of convenience" of the worst kind. Marriage *should* be a matter of convenience. Those who are never happy unless they are miserable, who invariably choose circumstances which are inconvenient, and who seem to glory in their own undoing—veritable mental masochists—may choose to ignore the dangers of economic insecurity and may even take pleasure in marrying financial liabilities. But while marriage ought to be a matter of convenience to both partners, it is not solely a financial partnership, neither should it be a risky adventure based on the idea that love will compensate for every lack of comfort and for years of hard struggle against adversity.

We all know that some people put pounds before persons and shillings before sentiment, and their pride behind them. They marry money instead of a flesh-and-blood partner. Those who marry a dream-creation, instead of a real person, marry while in the throes of infatuation. They are "in love".

Most happy marriages are between the two extremes indicated. They are rational marriages which are contracted by people who can see straight, and who do a little hard thinking about so serious a matter as marriage, choosing their partners only after having carefully weighed them up.

It has been said by some psychologists that people who "fall in love at first sight," in the ordinary sense of the term, never attain a really happy love-life. That, however, is a somewhat extreme view, although it contains sufficient truth to be heeded as a warning. There are dangers, dire dangers, inseparable from the state of infatuation, and they are serious enough to render it extremely undesirable that those "in love" should marry. Nevertheless, observation has convinced me that it is possible for two persons who have been "mad"—apt word!—about each other, to fall out of love, yet not into the

Slough of Despond. The bump of the fall may cause them to think furiously. A little hard thinking saves many a marriage.

Looking at each other clearly, without the distortion caused by the rosy-tinted spectacles of infatuation, they may begin to realise that if they want their marriage to succeed, they must do something about it. The one "made in heaven" having failed, they may be wise enough to set out to make one here on earth, where, after all, it has to remain and work, if work it will! Accordingly, they may settle down to a sensible relationship of *friendship plus physical intimacy*.

They *may* do this. But for every couple who do attain a sound love-relationship after infatuation, there are a score or more who do not. There are real DANGERS in falling in love!

Marie was brought up in a military atmosphere. Her father was a born leader of men—stern-faced, but with a smile which would transform his face wonderfully, and which, coming after the impressively stern expression, had the magic power to flood the whole home with sunshine. Marie's three brothers were all older than she. So far as she was concerned, about the best they ever did was to ignore her. Often they played rather cruel tricks at her expense.

There was a sister, whom we will call Gloria—a radiant creature who attracted attention wherever she went, for she was at once beautiful and accomplished, blessed with the social gifts and enormously popular. The boys were the mothers' main interest. After them, Gloria claimed most attention; she was always doing so much, always being asked to functions which required especially careful preparation, that her mother inevitably had to devote more time to this attractive girl than to the quite pleasant, but in no way striking, Marie.

But Marie had one loyal, admiring, unfailing friend—her father. Stern military disciplinarian though he was, he pampered Marie. Looking back through the years Marie could recall the tall, erect man with the stern features and close-clipped moustache becoming "all human" so soon as he was alone with her. The first big shock of Marie's life came during the first World War, when her father left her. A bigger shock came later, with the news of his death in action. Marie was young then.

Later the natural inclination to seek a mate stirred Marie. Thousands of men crossed her path. Something, however, seemed wrong with all of them. None were quite good enough for her. Those who knew her at this stage remarked that she was a girl with high ideals, that she made big demands. She did, indeed! The young men she met all seemed immature, silly, awkward. The older men lacked the kind of distinction she admired. Could she explain, to a close, well-loved girl friend, the kind of man she hoped to wed?

On one occasion she tried to do so. Rather vaguely, her ideal was a man who was brave; yes, very brave. He must be tall, erect, soldierly, with a stern expression which, however, could change into a veritable flood of sunshine when he smiled.

When the second World War took Europe in its grip, Marie was a woman of about forty, still unwed, and with a none-too-high opinion of men in general. With her military background and inclinations she aspired to "do her bit." Possibly aided by the former, she soon secured commissioned rank in one of the women's services.

Just before she went, she came to see me. She told me, laughingly, that while she got on very well with men she felt very strongly that "men are not what they were. Nowadays they seem to me to be a flabby lot! Maybe I'll find some *real* men in the Army." And knowing what I did of her background, I was able to agree, for I believed, in my heart, that even a uniform on a man would make a fifty per cent difference in her estimate of his worth!

At the particular station to which she was posted there was an officer of much the same age as her father had been when he left for France, early in 1917. No, he did *not* resemble her late father. He was of a totally different build. There was a uniform, of course; but, then, all the men on the station wore uniform. The only real resemblance this man bore to Marie's father lay in his moustache—close-clipped, as her father's was—and in the way his somewhat stern face would suddenly break into a frank, open, teeth-showing smile.

But that moustache, and that smile, meant love at the very first glance for Marie. They provided sufficient stimulus to bring back the pleasure, the feeling of security, and all the other desirable things which, throughout the years, though vaguely, she had associated with just such trifling features. The plain, unvarnished truth was, of course, that Marie was not in love with this man at all. She was in love with a little close-clipped hair on his upper lip and the way he smiled!

No matter that the officer had a wife and a baby son. Nothing mattered save her love. She was prepared to sacrifice all for "him," or, more accurately, that moustache, and she did. There is no need for me to follow her subsequent career, to tell the story of her tragedy, which did not concern her alone, but injured several others. The point to note is that there are thousands of Maries in this world. They march through our Divorce Courts in their hundreds year by year. For, once infatuation passes—and its very intensity ensures that it will burn itself out quickly—what is there left? *Only disillusionment!*

This, of course, is an extreme example of infatuation. But it is not a rare one. Much more general as regards its results is the case of a young man we will call James—a brilliant young man who combined outstanding intellectual gifts and a very striking presence, and, over and above that, the good fortune to have been born into a family both wealthy and eminent.

James moved in the best society. He was one of the most eligible of the "eligibles." A wonderful future was predicted for him. Then he staggered everybody by falling madly in love with a mere "nobody," according to the standards of his circle—one who was exceedingly untidy in appearance, and, to crown all, had markedly round shoulders. The round shoulders were, indeed, the outstanding characteristic—the one thing you saw at a quick glance, and probably the main impression you carried away.

Now the strangest thing about it all was that James loved those shoulders. In fact, they were the key to his infatuation. It was, indeed, the shoulders that he was in love with, not poor Janet! For when James was very young, he had found pleasure in the company of a governess who had helped him with his early studies—a woman with what is called a "scholarly stoop."

Every impression which reaches us through any one of our senses remains. It is never entirely lost. In that store-house of the mind, the unconscious, it lies dormant until something happens, or is seen or heard, which revives it. You may have long since "forgotten" the house where your little playmate of

childhood days lived. But if someone showed you a photograph of the place, as likely as not you would say: "H'm. It's strange, but I have a vague feeling that I know that house." Or complete recognition might come suddenly.

You would remember—or, a better way of putting it, *re-collect*. For when we remember we *collect* again, from the store of impressions in the unconscious, this or that particular item. Whether or not an impression can be collected again, appears to depend entirely upon the strength of the stimulus to aid recall.

Thus when James, dropping one afternoon into a café, saw a girl sitting unaccompanied, *and with that stoop*, his heart missed a beat. He must know her. He must possess her. That one trifling feature, her stoop, brought back all the love and trust which the governess had inspired many years before. And more than that—for throughout the years the ideal pattern which had formed in the young man's mind had added many virtues which even the governess had not possessed. Every one of these virtues was linked with those round shoulders.

Now when one is "bitten by the love-bug" in this manner, things are pretty serious. The early impressions linked with love exert a tremendously strong influence. The stimulus which recalls the love-pattern may be a trifle of physical appearance, such as we have noted, or it may be a mannerism, a tone of voice, a perfume, even an article of dress. Any one of these may serve to call out from the past the "love-ideal" which, perhaps for many years, has been shaping itself within the mind, and which began with some early pleasurable experience.

Of course, it by no means followed that Janet would fall in love with James. The fact that James was so much in love with her strengthened the chances of her doing so, for just as we all tend to like those who appreciate us, so love tends to attract love. But it does not always do so. Janet might not have felt in the least attracted to James. She might have had her own love-pattern, for which she was unconsciously, perhaps consciously, searching. And it might not have been linked with him in that way.

On the other hand, she might love him in a quieter, more rational manner. Or she may love in almost reciprocal fashion. That would involve a mutual infatuation. The term means that two persons simultaneously are stimulated by impressions of the kind referred to, so that there is instantaneous selection on both sides. Such mutual infatuations are of terrific intensity. For that very reason they are usually short-lived.

Now James's friends could show him the differences in their social positions, standards of life, cultural background and so on, which divided him from Janet, and every word they said would be wasted. Janet was the girl of his dreams. That was the trouble! She was *entirely of his dreams*. When he woke up he saw her clearly, noted her poor manners, her bad grammar (or lack of it) and all the other drawbacks which were perfectly plain for all the rest of the world to see.

Why do infatuated lovers laugh to scorn any adverse comment regarding the objects of their affection? Why do they refuse to listen to advice calculated to save them from a hopelessly unsuitable union? The reason is that those who are infatuated build up, from some slight mannerism, characteristic or feature, a whole structure which is full of virtues, *but which does not exist outside of their own imagination!*

We see that "falling in love" exposes people to the direst dangers. For surely it is dangerous to marry someone who does not exist—a dream-creation who will, however, sooner or later appear to your astonished eyes as just an ordinary mortal! And it is dangerous to enter into a contract which is intended to be lasting, while seeing things which do not exist!

When the mutual infatuation cools, the previously love-blinded parties find themselves staring at each other in stark astonishment. For now they see each other as normal people do. That means that the faults begin to show up. They are likely to appear outside, even though they are no bigger than the average load carried by most people. This discovery is intensely annoying. Generally, the parties feel that they have been grossly deceived. Often they try to punish each other for what they regard as a cruel betrayal.

Marriage between parties in the throes of infatuation is nothing more or less than a gamble. It rarely lasts.

After seeing only perfection in each other, it is rather disconcerting to discover that you are both merely human after all! That is the worst of this romantic conception of "love." You fall into love, and you fall out of it. If after these falls you can get your feet firmly fixed on good, solid earth and look facts in the face, you may be able to prevent disaster. But it takes some doing!

What can be done by those whose critical powers have returned after being in abeyance throughout a spell of infatuation? Well, first of all, do not blame your partner. Blame yourself. Realise that you were carried off your feet by something which is quite simply explained psychologically, and that millions of others have fallen in and out just as you have. That is encouraging, anyway!

Do not allow yourself to feel cheated. It will not help one bit for either party to blame the other or to hold a lurking grudge which is bound to poison the future. The best thing to do is to sit down calmly and do some hard thinking. Survey the whole position. See whether you can put your relationship on a sound, rational basis, so that your marriage will become a working partnership towards a common end. If this is not possible, it is probably best that the marriage be terminated. You owe that much to yourselves and to any children who, otherwise, might be born of a loveless union.

But give yourself time. Do not rush matters unduly. If both husband and wife make an honest effort to bring their reason to bear, the problem may prove capable of solution along rational lines.

As we have noted, it is still customary for parents, preachers and writers to speak as though the blinding infatuation were the only love worthy of the name. I must stress that genuine love is something infinitely finer. The true test of love is not the intensity of feeling at the beginning of a romance. It is the driving-power which it provides throughout a long adventure, the measure of enrichment of life which it yields not for a day or a month, but for years.

The innumerable books, sermons and broadcasts which treat the romantic conception of love as the very soul of "high tone" are responsible for the degraded idea of love which is so widely prevalent. They tend to deride the love which is likely to last. They enthrone the temporary kind, which ought never to be termed love but always infatuation.

Society—with a *small "s"*—that vast conglomeration of laws and regulations and customs and codes cannot, alas, be proceeded against at law. Responsible though it is for the most deadly campaign against happy marriage,

by its furtherance of romantic drivel through press, platform and pulpit, no one concerned with the promotion of married happiness can proceed against it. Otherwise, society might find itself in the dock at the Old Bailey, trying to justify its false insistence upon romantic fallacies, trying to explain how infatuation, which for so long has been dignified with the name of Love, can yield long years of lasting happiness in marriage which, society holds, should be permanent.

One would like also to challenge those preachers and broadcasters who spread the romantic delusion, to climb into their pulpits or take up their scripts to defend the magic, "made in heaven" doctrine which yields this infantile belief that "being in love" is the right state in which to marry. The unfortunate young people who, following the teaching of years, are delighted when infatuation seizes them, are encouraged by such blind leaders of the blind to marry. They should be warned against it!

The false romantic "love" rarely passes the test of months. The genuine love, which alone is worthy of the name, can stand the test of years. And there is this added point, often overlooked, but extremely illuminating:

While some marriages fail because of an absence of love between the parties at the outset, a far greater number fail because the partners are blinded by infatuation to incompatibilities which are perfectly plain to others.

You owe it to yourself to give reason and common sense a chance in your love.

CHAPTER III

ADAPTATION TO LIFE

THIS is an age of realism. People say: "We must face the facts." They say it of marriage, and they are right. But the only way to face the facts of marriage is to face the facts about ourselves. That involves finding out how we stand in relation to the world about us, including other people.

Even the most practical person has day-dreams. The building of castles in the air may sometimes serve a useful purpose; it may be part of our purposeful thinking directed towards the attainment of desirable ends. But most of this mental castle-building tends to draw us away from reality. We plan things which we know perfectly well will never happen. We do it because we derive satisfaction from such pleasant escapes from the hard realities of the world.

We can picture ourselves winning a sweepstake, even in a country where sweepstakes are forbidden by law. We can safely dream that someone else's attractive husband or wife is madly in love with us. We can perform amazing feats of athletics without any need to go into training, can amass millions without needing to work or risk any money in speculation, and can become exactly what we choose—all for the asking. In this world of dreams anything is possible; we can rise to the heights of sublimity, or we can descend to the depths of depravity.

Within limits, day-dreaming may be a pleasant and harmless form of escape. It becomes dangerous, however, when it assumes importance in our lives, when we rely upon it unduly, and when it takes the place of action. So long as it merely serves as a brief relaxation, a "break" from the difficult business of living, it is no more to be condemned than is an occasional visit to a cinema, where our day-dreaming is guided by what we see on the screen.

What better retreat could we devise than a quiet haven to which we can retire for a spell whenever the hard facts of life appear just a little too hard to bear! The day-dream is nothing more or less than a defence-method, useful in its rightful place, but dangerous when carried to extremes because it always represents a *retreat from life*. It is always immediately available whenever we feel the need for it. It follows that the more unsatisfactory we find the business of living, the greater is the satisfaction we derive from day-dreaming.

During the last fifty years we have learned quite a lot about day-dreams and day-dreamers. We know that those who easily accept this form of defence against reality tend to take little pleasure in the ordinary pursuits of life. They often want to be alone. They do not "mix" well. They like to plough lonely furrows in their work. They cannot stand criticism. They do not fit in happily with the organised pattern of communal life.

Those who tend to withdraw from reality in this and in other ways rarely realise that their unsociable and unco-operative qualities account for their failure to enjoy life and to succeed in its various activities. Instead, they invariably make excuses. They shift the responsibility in various ingenious ways.

They say: "Women nowadays are much too mannish and aggressive for my liking," when they should say: "I fear the competition of women." They say: "Marriage is too big a gamble to appeal to me," when they should say: "I'm too big a coward to accept the responsibilities which marriage entails." They always put things the wrong way round so as to appear in the right themselves.

One very widely-used method of shifting responsibility from themselves is magic. Imitative magic is based on the principle that all things which resemble each other are the same; contagious magic on the principle that things which have once been in contact with each other always remain in contact. Charms which are supposed to cure ills by imitating them are examples of the first. Safety from snakebites may be guaranteed to all who wear a "lucky snake," possibly in the form of a brooch. The ancient Hindoos used to treat yellow jaundice by painting the unfortunate victim a brighter yellow than ever!

You find a good example of contagious magic in Suffolk. There, if a man should cut himself with a scythe, he would immediately oil *the scythe*! Why? Well, that is the way to prevent the wound from festering, according to the superstition which still lingers on.

You may laugh at the man who oils his scythe to prevent a wound on his body from festering. But what about the people who denounce marriage when things go wrong? It never occurs to them that the trouble is within themselves. They condemn the instrument. Marriage is simply a means of living the intimate life along lines which best fit in with the general social pattern, and which provides for family life so as to ensure the well-being of the young. It is only a means to an end. If the end is not attained, then the people using the means are failing—no one else and nothing else.

If you want to know why the subject of magic should be introduced into a discussion of marriage, remember that marriage is for grown-ups so far as the emotions are concerned. Reliance upon magic is one of the childish ways of shifting responsibility. It is one of the common characteristics displayed by the neurotic individual. Here let me stress that the word "neurotic" has been used to cover a multitude of sins and it is in this rather broad sense that I shall employ it.

About the most difficult thing under the sun for the neurotic is team-work. That is why neurotic people generally experience grave difficulties in marriage, which is, above all, a matter of team effort, though the team numbers only two. The neurotic tends to be an individualist, not in the desirable sense, but in the sense of not being able to pull his weight with others.

If you cannot "fit in" to the main organised pattern of communal life, you become, to some extent, at any rate, a misfit. Many marriage misfits are neurotics. But do not be unduly troubled if as the result of reading this chapter you discover that you possess certain neurotic symptoms.

Many of the greatest men and women in the world have been misfits from the social point of view. Indeed, the creative urge which prompts genius is usually linked with extreme sensitiveness. Thus the attributes of genius are the characteristics of the neurotic. Yes, the neurotics are in good company.

But the very fact that so many artists, poets, writers and other creative workers have been unhappy in their love-lives—and history shows that perfectly plainly—is a sufficient warning that those who feel things intensely do not make the best of partners, unless they deliberately adjust themselves to the demands of marriage.

Generally, the neurotic is either "right up" or "right down." He tends to be very easily elated, very easily depressed. Tremendous enthusiasm is often followed by utter boredom. In even the smallest things of life, "all or nothing" is his motto. His reactions are so whole and thorough that, very often, he achieves much. But—and it is a very big "But" where marriage is concerned—he is a bad co-operator. This is but one example of the difficulties which may beset the neurotically inclined.

Often neurotics will eagerly attempt the unusual, or rise to specific demands which stir the blood and quicken the heart. It is in the ordinary, often dull, routine of life that they fail. And, when you think it out, life consists very largely of routine. The exalted moments, the stirring deeds, the terrific tests are few and far between. The real test is the everyday life, and that is nine-tenths routine for ninety-nine people out of a hundred.

It is precisely the same with marriage. Indeed, there is no sphere of life in which routine is more marked than in this. Although you may avoid monotony in the intimate relations, there still remains the fact that the greater part of married life consists simply of living together, rising in the morning, eating meals, performing the tasks of a joint home, but rarely experiencing "exciting" moments.

Easily the clearest indication of a faulty outlook lies in failure to realise the vital importance in life of co-operation. To fail to realise this is to fail to understand the whole meaning of life. All sound social behaviour demands co-operation. You cannot be a good citizen, a good employee, a good clubman, or anything else which involves contact with others, unless you possess the capacity to co-operate, to accept the laws of the land, the rules of the game,

or whatever else may be involved. And all this applies with added force to marriage, which is co-operation in its highest form.

One reason why so many find it hard to co-operate is that they never understand other people. They suffer from an emotional undercurrent of fear and anxiety which causes them to avoid competition unless they are certain to win. This leads to growing isolation. The result is—to quote Dr. Beran Wolfe: “The average neurotic *believes* he is a misunderstood god, and *acts* as if he were a discouraged worm.”

How does this all work out? Well, fear of social contacts may result in headaches whenever a social engagement is scheduled. The headaches are a sort of smoke-screen behind which the unhappy one can avoid the contacts he dreads. Make-believe dominates his life. Contemplation is always preferred to action. Pleasant thoughts are employed as a substitute for cold facts which, as likely as not, urgently need facing. And so it goes on.

This is not the place in which to delve deeply into a subject which demands a book in itself. But here I must indicate some of the ways in which attempts are made to evade reality. One very common way lies in avoiding action along most of life's battle-fronts, but concentrating with terrific energy upon one sector. The man of business who toils late night after night, “working himself right out” in this one part of his life, is a case in point. Marriage, the human relationships outside of business, indeed, all that makes his business worth while—since it should be a means of bringing fullness of life generally—are subordinated to the one part.

You find the same technique, the same pattern of evasion, adopted by people who treat sex as everything. As we have seen, sex is only a part of the love-relationship. Some seek one hundred per cent sexual satisfaction and are irritated and puzzled if they do not get it! Needless to say, since one hundred per cent of anything is rarely attainable—this is true even of trouble!—they do not find what they seek. So off they go from one “affair” to another. Each time they ask the question: “Am I satisfied?” And each time the answer is: “No!”

This largely explains why elderly women run after youths, why wealthy women spend small fortunes on gigolos, why men pass from mistress to mistress yet never find happiness. You see, there is such a thing as failure in personal relationships. The man who misses the real thing, the woman whom genuine love passes by, may adopt the attitude of making sex the substitute for love. And how they build around the symbol of their failure! How they strive to deceive themselves that each new defeat is a triumph! The man who boasts of a score of “conquests” is confessing—though he does not realise it—to exactly twenty failures!

The normal, well-balanced person determines to learn from a failure, to profit by experience, to act more wisely next time. Where love is concerned, the old saying about there being “more fish in the sea than ever came out of it” is recalled, and the implication acted upon. But the neurotic tends to let one failure become part of his very life, either by treating it as a triumph, or else by letting it colour his whole outlook on life, so that he fears failure in every important effort and so tries to avoid effort. If he does not make *everything* of one sector of the battlefront, as we have seen many do, he retires from the front altogether and tries to live for all the world as though the battle of life were not being waged.

So far this chapter may have proved depressing—even perhaps alarming—to you. Tell me though of any one who claims freedom from all neurotic traits!

In a sense, then, we are *all* subject to idiosyncrasies in varying degrees. "Normality" in human behaviour is a goal towards which we can strive, a standard by which we can judge. But it is an ideal state. The perfect human being does not exist. So if you learn from this chapter that you possess one or more of these characteristics do not tell your husband, your wife, or yourself that you are a neurotic.

If you display any of the symptoms mentioned in this chapter, there is no need at all to rush to the conclusion that there must be something wrong with your mind. The perfectly "right" mind is something to be prayed for. Only in an age of miracles will the prayer be fully answered.

No, you will be well advised to regard these little departures from what is desirable as failings of yourself *as a whole*. People who become worried about their minds never do themselves the slightest good. And, come to think of it, we do rather tend to treat body and mind as being totally separate things. Some psychologists talk as though the mind were something distinct and complete in itself; but for all practical purposes—and you are concerned only with the practical aspect—this is not so.

If someone is ill, a *person* is ill. Mental illness is illness of person not merely of mind. As Dr. George H. Preston puts it in his admirable little book: *Psychiatry for the Curious*, "No mind ever went to church, or to jail, by itself, or to the poorhouse, or even to the mental hospital. Mental illness is Person Illness just as is pneumonia, typhoid fever, or heart disease."

If you suffer an attack of influenza your mind is certain to be disturbed. If you win a big sweepstake, your mind will re-act. Our minds are part and parcel of ourselves, just as are our arms, legs, hearts, and lungs. What you must think of is your behaviour as a *total person* with a body and, we hope, something of a soul; a group of friends and relations and, we hope, a job; a certain measure of power to carve out your life in the way you choose, and, we hope, a desire to attain all-round improvement by whatever proper means are at hand.

Far too many people attach labels to themselves when all they need to do is to set to work right away to effect an improvement. Nobody who reads this book will become an angel or a superman. But by getting to know more about neurosis we may, perhaps, prevent the deepening of traits which might otherwise ruin our marriages, cripple our lives and work a vast amount of havoc.

So far as marriage is concerned, undue self-concern above all else renders mutual co-operation difficult or impossible. What a grave drawback it is! Thousands of couples whose marriages might easily have proved utter failures because of the absence of most of the desirable prerequisites, have nevertheless contrived to move closer towards each other instead of apart. Why?

Because of the co-operative element, the pulling together, the shouldering of a common task. Whether this co-operation takes the form of mutual effort for their children, or a common enthusiasm for some form of social service, a shared avocation, the result is much the same. The neurotic is on the path to improvement just as soon as he begins looking out and not in. And so soon as he is active in some form of work with others, even with some thought or prospect of material reward, he is developing that social sense, that co-operative power

which will "take him out of himself." The great saying of Christ: "He that loseth his life shall save it; he that saveth his life shall lose it" has been proved profoundly true by modern psychology.

A neurosis can be cured. It may prove necessary for the victim to be aided to that "whole-ness" which is health. It may take much time. But if you discover in yourself certain traits which now seem surprisingly neurotic, and you wish to be rid of them so as to live your life in the real world instead of dodging the genuine issues and contenting yourself with dreams and evasions, depend upon it, you can start to improve straightaway. It is a matter of adjustment, when all is said and done. And however much others may help you towards self-adjustment, it would not be *self*-adjustment if you yourself did not have the main part to play.

The poorly-adjusted may have feelings of doubt as to their own abilities. These doubts may accompany them everywhere. Thus a person may return to a room three or four times simply to make certain he has switched off the light. He may never enjoy a run out into the country because of the haunting dread that he has left all sorts of things dangerously unattended to at home.

If you are so troubled, the first thing to be clear about is how the whole technique of evasion has come to rule your life. Once you know that, you will be in a position to study maps with a view to finding a path which will lead to a better way of life. A check to progress which was intensely felt, the failure of a love-affair, a financial crash, discouragement, some injury to pride which went very deep—such things as these cause many people to drop back to a way of reaction which is childish.

Instead of taking a "philosophical" view, which actually is simply a common-sense one, they put up, in actions if not in words, a defence against the criticism which they feel is likely to be levelled against them. And this defence, whilst it might be quite appropriate in childhood, is hopelessly out of place in an adult. To a great extent, the child we were still exists in all of us. But with the neurotic there is much more of the child that was, remaining or recalled. A pattern of behaviour based on some emotional experience in early life is used as a shield against the world. It becomes very real—becomes, indeed, the dominating force in one's life—although it is a negative force which stills initiative and prevents action instead of acting as a driving-force. Yet the roots lie deep in the recesses of the unconscious.

To illustrate in the simplest manner, you may "keep yourself to yourself" and cite this as one of your virtues. The key to your withdrawal from others would become more apparent if you should have to interview someone in authority. You would dread the interview. You would try to escape it. And when it took place, you would blush, or stammer, or contradict yourself and generally cut a thoroughly bad figure. What you are doing is this: actually you would be identifying yourself—though you might not realise it—with a little boy who was you, years ago, perhaps facing his first caning before a severe-looking headmaster.

You may have been a person full of "drive," confidence and success. Then, with a financial crash, all your self-confidence has vanished, and now the slightest responsibility is not merely distasteful to you, but positively agonising to you. The crash has simply precipitated the check to progress, the discouragement, to which I referred, and the falling back to a childish reaction has followed.

But when all is said, and done, the one outstanding fact to keep firmly in mind is this: that all neurotic symptoms are a part of **YOUR ADAPTATION TO LIFE**. They represent the camouflage you have put over yourself, or the shield you use to defend yourself against "life." Very well, then. Now that you know what the trouble is, you can help yourself by being willing to discard camouflage which is easily seen through by the discerning, a shield so heavy that it is weighing you down.

Ill-adjusted people refuse to live according to the set rules. They say: "I won't play." The childish attitude is there, although the words employed may be different. "I regret exceedingly that social engagements henceforth will be out of the question for me because of the headaches which invariably accompany them" is simply "I won't play!" in adult language. But you *must* play. You must learn team-work. And as you get busy working with others, the sensitiveness which is part of your endowment will help you to make a better contribution than most.

If you have got a deep-rooted feeling that the world is unfriendly towards you, that other people are hostile to you, one way to help correct it is to go out into the world more, to meet others and to work with them. Service for others—which is service to yourself—is the main key for opening the gates of happiness. And it is one of the main keys for opening the gates of health to the neurotic.

Neurotic symptoms are almost certain to worsen with time. As you become more and more isolated from the main streams of life, as you withdraw more and more into yourself, the task of redirecting your attitude will be the more difficult. Your adjustment to life is simply your real attitude to the men and women around you. It includes in particular your attitude to your partner in marriage. *That is why it is so vital to your marriage.*

CHAPTER IV

CHARACTER TYPES

WILLIAM JAMES, in his well-known book, *Pragmatism*, says that "The history of philosophy is, to a great extent, that of a certain clash of human temperaments." What he says of philosophy is true of marriage—any marriage. There is bound to be some clash of temperaments, simply because no two human beings are exactly alike.

It has often been urged that "incompatibility of temperament" should be regarded as adequate grounds for the dissolution of a marriage. Yet it is extremely doubtful that we could find one case of genuine, *complete* compatibility of temperament in one thousand reasonably happy marriages. Every successful marriage must have begun with some measure of incompatibility between the temperaments of the partners. It is helpful to bear this in mind; for the adjustment which marriage demands is that of one individual to another, or of two individuals to each other, the latter, of course, being the ideal. And this includes the adjustment of two temperaments.

If we study human beings closely we soon realise that their apparent likeness is *only* apparent; that, in fact, they differ greatly one from another. Certain qualities, or mixtures of qualities in varying proportions, make each individual unique, with characteristics peculiar to that one person. In spite of this, however, it is possible to classify people according to the groupings into which they roughly belong, although each human being differs at least in some minor respect, from others within the same group.

Philosophers, psychologists and others have long attempted to discover the best way in which to classify people according to temperament. This is not at all a simple matter. The word "temperament" is used in a number of different ways. We speak of the *artistic* temperament when we wish to convey the impression of an unstable personality, capable of springing spectacular surprises and expressing itself in fits and starts. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as an artistic temperament, but, instead, many different temperaments possessed by artists of various kinds. Even so, for everyday use the term serves its purpose; when we hear the expression, we know what is meant. We sometimes hear references made to a woman's *ardent* temperament, or to a man's *cold, calculating, acquisitive* temperament—terms which aid comprehension in ordinary conversation but which are not strictly accurate. Here, by temperament, we mean general disposition, and that broadly may be defined as the sum total of our moods.

Our temperament is, then, really our cast of mind; or, as it is sometimes aptly expressed, "the feeling tone of the mind." One classification gives four types of temperament: the sanguine, the choleric, the melancholic, and the phlegmatic. Temperament is closely linked with character; indeed, the various types grouped according to temperamental traits frequently are described as "Character Types." Perhaps it is better to regard them as being classifications according to general disposition, as I have said; character goes rather deeper, and is dependent in part upon what we make of our temperaments.

We cannot make our own temperament. That much is certain. But it can make or mar us. Undoubtedly it is determined largely by inheritance. We find ourselves as we are, and, if we are wise, we accept ourselves as we are, and do not make the common mistake of trying to imagine or pretend that we are totally different. But having first accepted ourselves in this way, we can strive to make the most of our endowment. That involves adjustment—the adjustment of our own temperament to the temperaments of others. Since marriage means a long period of close communion with another, the adjustment of our own temperament to that of the partner in marriage is of supreme importance.

In the rough classifications already mentioned the temperamental characteristics of the four types are as follows:—

Sanguine: Enthusiastic but changeable.

Choleric: Passionate, easily aroused, prone to anger.

Phlegmatic: Sluggish and generally indifferent.

Melancholic: Depressed and sad.

Our general tendency, and our point of view, clearly will depend very largely upon which of these groups we belong to. Each group has its own characteristics, and they carry with them their own challenge. How we respond to that challenge is important. If we say to Temperament, in effect, "You win!"

and leave it at that, an important phase of character-formation will have been lost to us.

Happy is the person who can rightly be classified as *sanguine*; his mind tends to be cheerful, hopeful, quiet—in many respects he is to be envied. But just because he has these pleasant tendencies he may be tempted to view life through rose-tinted glasses and not make allowances for others whose temperamental endowment is totally different. In his generally tense state the man of *choleric* temperament may rush in to demand sweeping reforms, and may find it hard to understand why the multitude does not share his enthusiasm for radical changes. The woman who feels that everything she might attempt is foredoomed to failure, and who therefore never attempts anything, is the *phlegmatic* type. She finds it exceedingly difficult to convince herself that she can, by an effort of will, take action which will make her happier and also increase the comfort and well-being of those around her. The individual who walks hand-in-hand with fear is the *melancholic*, a source of misery to himself and to all around him.

We can easily realise what difficulties may have to be overcome in order to attain reasonable adjustment in marriage if we "marry" a man from any one of these groups to a woman from any other group. And since marriage is a matter of mutual adjustment we have to bring the matter right home to ourselves by looking at it both ways, namely, by considering how we can adjust our own temperament to that of our partner in marriage, and also by seeing how it affects him or her. Thus a sanguine-group man married to a woman who is obviously of the choleric group would realise that his more intense enthusiasms, especially when accompanied or followed by inconsistency, must inevitably intensely annoy his partner. On the other hand, the choleric woman aware of her grouping, would make allowances for her sanguine husband, and, with understanding, possibly derive sympathetic amusement from his intense periods of enthusiasm for this one day, and for something totally different the very day after! And she, for her part, would also try to count the proverbial ten before rushing into argument, or displaying anger. To know our type gives us a measure of power. We ought to make use of it.

We are what we are. But we need not accept ourselves as we are and make no attempt at improvement. Modification is not impossible; indeed, people are constantly accepting the fact of their own temperament and are using the knowledge to attain greater usefulness and happiness, and a better adjustment towards the temperaments of others near and dear to them. One of the quietest, most even-tempered men I ever met surprised me once by relating how, when he was at school, he had nearly killed another boy. "I had a very hot temper," he said. "I hit this boy and he fell. I waited for him to get up, but he didn't. Then I went to the headmaster and told him that I'd killed the boy." Happily the boy was alive though unconscious. But the incident gave my friend such a shock that he vowed then and there that he would master his temper. He succeeded to a remarkable degree.

Others, without such an experience to encourage reform, realise that certain temperamental traits do them harm, and act accordingly. Many a business man has done so. Many a girl, too, has sought to eliminate what she felt was a defect of temperament which tended to mar her attractiveness. If only more married people would do the same thing with a view to ensuring genuine adjustment to temperament within marriage we should hear much less

of "incompatibility of temperament." That would be accepted as a matter of course—something to be dealt with, part of the inevitable adjustment necessitated by the love-relationship.

Jung, the great psychologist, devoted much attention to type psychology. He divided human beings into two character classes—Introverts and Extroverts. The former tend to look inwards; they "live within themselves" and take little interest in the outside world. Extroverts, on the other hand, take little interest in their own thoughts, but are absorbed in the life about them. They often indulge in general over-activity, and in extreme cases are so vigorous in activities which are remote from their own problems that they are said to "go round in circles."

A very large number of sub-divisions can be made under these two main headings, but for practical purposes the following demand our attention. First, the *Introvert Thinking Type*.

He—it is usually a man—attaches great importance to ideas. He spends much time thinking and often sees both sides of a question so clearly that he cannot make up his mind which side to support, or what action to take. If he thinks about a person, or indeed about anything, he does so in a cold, unemotional way. He goes his own way in life, and does not seek the approval of others. This type of man thinks a great deal but never to much purpose. His thinking is not constructive; it gets him nowhere; it does not yield achievement. Needless to say, such a man is usually quite incapable of a strong love-attachment. He enjoys taking things to pieces in his mind, and his liking for analysis may make him study his wife as a sort of interesting phenomenon, but beyond that his interest is poor. His emotional make-up is such that his sex-drive invariably is weak.

Now we turn to an exceedingly interesting type—a woman, for this group is made up mostly of women—who, at first thought, may appear to be the feminine counterpart of the man just described. Known as the *Introvert Feeling Type*, this group is guided by feeling, but the feeling is very deep-rooted with the result that people usually jump to the conclusion that it is not there! The woman who falls within this category is usually regarded by those who know her—except perhaps by a few intimate friends or relations, and not always by them—as a cold, critical woman. Actually, she feels very strongly, but her feeling usually finds little outward expression.

There seems to be little of the emotional in the make-up of such a woman, but deep within her an emotional fire rages. She cares little for the life about her. She does not feel interested in other people. The outer world, indeed, means so little to her that she does not need to give expression to her emotions. Usually some hidden experience of the past, which has left its mark in the unconscious, accounts for her withdrawal from the life around her. Her emotion feeds a rich store of mental phantasies, and she values the feelings, or emotions, in themselves. These women are often unscrupulous, and there is often a marked touch of cruelty in their make-up. They are great schemers, and sometimes are very ambitious.

Because of the last three qualities, women of this group often meet with a good deal of success in spheres of activity where close, friendly human relations are not important. They can usually summon up sufficient pretended interest in others to enable them to achieve their desires within limits. If they marry, often it is as part of some wider scheme which they think will add to their power

or comfort. They are frankly selfish; all their emotion is spent on themselves.

There are other introvert types, but they are not of particular interest from the standpoint of marriage. It should be stressed, however, that as introverts always tend to look in rather than out, their interests generally are extremely personal and unsocial. They turn away from the community. They become rebels. And if the rebellious organisations which they sometimes join grow big or attain power, then they usually become rebels against them.

Now let us turn to an example of the *Extrovert Thinking Type*. Hitherto, this type has been more frequently male than female. Mr. Jones—shall we call him?—does not waste time, for that is how he would regard it, in considering his own mental processes. No, he is at one with his surroundings. He has fixed principles by which he lives, and he has pretty clear ideas also as to how everybody else should order his life. His own code of conduct has been carefully thought out; that done, he is well satisfied with it, and woe betide those who seek to interfere with it in any way! He likes plans, maps and graphs. Order is his watchword. If he is religious, half a dozen texts he has pondered over are his guiding stars, and he takes good care that the family also walks by them. He reduces his work to a simple system. His thinking is directed largely towards reducing things to systems, he is happy if his work provides him with opportunities to direct or plan the lives of others. He is the ideal bureaucrat.

Mr. Jones is guided by reason and by rules. People usually point to him as a model of something or other—a model employer, a model civil servant, a model churchman, a model husband. But he has his weaknesses. For instance, although his habit of thinking out all his plans and formulae often results in his winning a reputation as a very reasonable man, he is, in point of fact, very hard to influence. He reasons, but he does not listen well to the reasoning of others. He is likely to be intolerant, too. He has repressed his feelings to such an extent that he cannot attain a reasonable state of emotional friendliness with his associates, let alone his subordinates. Although his gaze is directed outward instead of inward, his attitude is too impersonal for him to be a “human” man; he is a slave of system, his conduct at work or in the home being entirely systematised.

Such a man as this often builds barriers between himself and his family. He becomes unapproachable. He loves plans more than people. He would rather be right than be loved. When he is middle-aged he often begins to wonder where he has gone wrong.

The feminine counterpart of Mr. Jones is the woman of the *Extrovert Feeling Type*, a group which consists almost entirely of women. Here, there is close contact with the outside world, but this contact is expressed through feeling. Like Mr. Jones, the woman in this group is a “rational” type; she does a great deal of “weighing up” and judging. But instead of doing this by thinking and reasoning, as we should ordinarily use these terms, she *feels* her way along. She is guided through life by feeling, which plays for her the part reasoning does in the Extrovert Thinking Type. This is a point which men find hard to understand; they sometimes credit such a woman with possessing “a quick brain,” and they are astonished if eventually they discover that feeling, not thought, achieves the decisions.

In the course of a study of Type Psychology, Dr. J. E. Nicole remarks with truth that there is a “logic of feeling” as well as a logic of reasoning, and he

describes the type we are considering as follows: "To her, the outer world is important and it has such a hold over her, that her feelings are apt to conform to certain patterns laid down for her by herd standards. Thus the Victorian maiden who fell in love did so heartily enough, yet it was more often than not with the young man who was 'suitable,' and was pointed out as agreeing with the general standards of desirability. Thinking as a function is not absent, but follows far behind in the wake of feeling. As a lady of this type once remarked, on being asked to accept the reasonableness of a particular line of thought, 'But I can't think what I don't feel!'"

Often the women of this group are vivacious and interesting, quick and eager; they make very good first impressions and it is only those who know them intimately who realise how great a part feeling plays in their "thinking." They tend to demand perfection in others, and are likely to belittle their partners in love. Their intimate friends usually observe curious inconsistencies. For instance, although such women are in close emotional contact with the outside world and are always exceedingly anxious to make a good impression, they frequently spoil a carefully-obtained effect by suddenly and impulsively giving way to spiteful comment. Tactless or even very offensive criticisms "come out" unexpectedly, and shock not only their friends, but the women themselves. Periods of self-pity and remorse often follow such outbursts.

These, then, are some of the types. It is not necessary that we should know exactly which character-type group we are in. Each can be split up into sub-divisions, and even then the persons in each sub-division differ as regards the intensity of their feelings and the proportions of the various ingredients of their mental make-up. But it is helpful to realise that there are these differences of character and temperament, and that they can be classified along the lines indicated. Once we do, we can study ourselves in the light of this knowledge, and see just where our weaknesses lie. We can strengthen our weak points and make effective use of our strong points. We can consider also the make-up of our partner in the love-relationship, and deliberately strive to adjust our own temperament to that other temperament which is so important to our own happiness.

To many, especially perhaps to young people, this matter of temperamental adjustment is regarded as being something so difficult that it is not worth attempting. Older people, however, often discover from their own experience of the shared life in marriage how important such adjustment is. The give and take which results from a recognition of their own and their partner's weak and strong points contributes powerfully to the solution of what is sometimes called "the problem of living together."

CHAPTER V

THE PERSONAL FACTOR IN MARRIAGE

"SUCCESS in marriage is much more than a matter of finding the right person; it is a matter of *being* the right person." So wrote an American author, Leland Foster Wood, and his words are well worth pondering. For so many people are concerned solely about finding "Mr. or Miss Right," that it never

occurs to them that, marriage being for two, it is vitally important that they themselves should be "right."

Here we have yet another illustration of the way in which the conventional attitude to love and marriage fosters irresponsibility. It places all the emphasis on "life" or "fate" instead of on the fact that the success or failure of a marriage will depend very largely upon the partners themselves.

It takes two to make a marriage, and marriage is what they make it. Two persons have got to pull together if the best results are to be obtained. The woman who wants to be a good wife should, therefore, keep well in mind this simple truth: That she is a wife only by virtue of having a husband! And the husband who aspires to play his part well must realise that he is a husband simply and solely because he has a wife.

Of course, this all sounds very obvious. But it is the obvious things which are so important in life, yet which claim little attention and indeed are often overlooked. Still more, their *implications* are likely to be overlooked.

The good wife is not a woman who exercises a strong appeal to men in general, nor a woman of whom people say: "She'd make an ideal wife for somebody." No, the supreme test is what sort of wife she makes *for her own husband*.

The good husband is not a man whose qualities made him rank high among the "eligibles" prior to marriage, nor one whose popularity among the fair sex has always been considerable. No, he can be judged only by reference to the one woman who is *his wife*—to her and no other.

Happy, lasting marriage involves a sound adjustment between two persons. One woman's "Mr. Right" may be all other women's "Mr. Wrong." And this adjustment, contrary to impressions held in some quarters, is not entirely a sexual one. Generally, sex plays a part. But there is more in it than sex. Indeed, it is possible for a marriage to be happy without sex directly entering into it to any degree worth mentioning.

Consider Disraeli's married life with his Mary Anne. She was not graceful in carriage, beauteous in feature, nor brilliant in intellect. Indeed, she dressed so badly that the bizarre garments of the Prime Minister's wife were the talk of the town. Her ideas about house-furnishing provoked endless amusement. Her ignorance in most matters was appalling. She "dropped bricks" by the score in the most awkward places—at dinner-parties and receptions attended by the most famous personages in the land. A veritable "Mrs. Wrong" for any man, let alone the Prime Minister of Great Britain, according to all the accepted standards!

Yet we have to face the undeniable fact that for thirty years she and her beloved "Dizzy" lived happily together!

"I may commit many follies in life," Disraeli once remarked, "but I never intend to marry for love." He remained unwed until he was 35. Then he married this woman who was fifteen years older than himself—a white-haired widow who, however, had plenty of money, which useful commodity the statesman lacked. She knew full well that Disraeli did not love her, in the ordinary, accepted sense of the word. But he was intensely grateful to her for much that she had done to help him. He said so, time and again, throughout his married life.

After they had married, she comforted and encouraged him in a thousand ways. The great statesman would rush home from the intellectual atmosphere

of Cabinet or Court, or from the gay wit of society dinner-parties, to spend precious moments with a woman who was neither beautiful, clever nor even tolerably well-informed. Why? Because he found that she was a perfect companion to him. Whatever else she lacked, she knew that one thing: *How to be a companion to the man she had married.*

After having lived with her for thirty years, Disraeli used to tell his friends, his utterly astonished friends, that he had never been bored for one moment by this woman whom the world thought silly. Nor was it a one-sided affair. For she said: "My life has been one long scene of happiness."

Here was a marriage which certainly was not based upon sexual attraction. But it was an impressive success. Most people, without the heavy cares of state which claimed Disraeli's time and energy, find that the sex element inevitably claims an important place in their lives. But here was a marriage which sprang from mutual respect and liking. It developed into love. Not love in the narrower, sexual sense; but love all the same.

That sex had little part in this union of a 35-year-old man and a 50-year-old woman is obvious. But what is equally clear is that the marriage brought rich happiness to both. It began with a mutual liking, and it ended with love. Two persons who, in spite of surface appearances which were all to the contrary, were really very well suited to each other, surmounted together all sorts of serious obstacles and found themselves drawn ever closer to each other by a constantly-deepening affection.

Each of these persons—the great statesman and the rather unattractive widow—was, in relation to the other, a perfect partner in marriage. Each was much the better for the other's encouragement and trust.

If a wife makes a husband feel that he is a model husband; if a husband makes a wife feel that she is a model wife, then they are indeed a happy pair. They are likely to remain so throughout their married life.

Here again, we cut right across the conventional approach to married happiness. Who has not witnessed films by the score in which "love ever after" has been secured by the process of a wife making her husband jealous? Who has not read novels in which a husband wins back a doubting wife's affections by making her feel insecure? The emphasis is entirely false. The use of a purely destructive emotion such as jealousy must be condemned; it is always dangerous.

From childhood onwards, we are all seeking security in some form or another. Even those who choose the most adventurous ways of life fear anything which might interfere with the exciting life they have chosen, and its rewards. But nowhere is security more vitally important than in marriage; indeed, the very word "security" is the best single-word reason there is for marriage. Immediately a suspicion of insecurity enters the marriage circle, one object of marriage has been partly lost, at least for the moment. The successful marriage provides security for both partners and for any children which result from the union. And not only must they be secure, but they must *feel* secure. If they do not feel sheltered and safe within the family, the door is open to all sorts of dangers.

There is a host of influences which tend to convey the impression that jealousy can be made to serve a valuable and constructive purpose in marriage. By so doing, they work infinitely more harm to marriage than all the sex books ever written could possibly do, even including those frankly written to

serve a pornographic purpose. That may seem an extreme assertion but it is the truth.

The problem of the husband or wife is incapable of solution along any of the lines opened up by emotional immaturity. It is a difficult problem, nothing less than this: how to remain a lover and be loved though married. Falling in and out of love is simple enough; neither calls for any effort. These things merely "happen." But to keep love alive and warm within marriage for years on end—that is a task which calls for the possession of certain qualities. *You* must be "right."

It is a good plan to regard love, not as the starting-point in marriage, so much as *the end to be sought* in marriage. Given that basic realisation at the outset, we are certain to recognise that deliberate effort on our part is called for—that marriage is not something apart from ourselves. We are part of it. All the time we are shaping it, for good or ill. All the time we are creating the conditions in which love can develop, or else rendering its growth impossible. There is no standing still in human affairs, and this applies to marriage as to all else. No marriage remains static. Either there is progress, or there is a slipping back—into danger.

It is clear, then, that the married lover has to accept a responsibility, and a heavy one. On their wedding day husbands and wives begin to build a structure called Marriage out of changeable material—themselves. All the time there must be adjustment and readjustment between the two partners. The "feelings" of both partners must affect things at every stage. It follows, therefore, that psychological factors count for a great deal. And here a word of warning is necessary.

In this book a good deal of attention is necessarily devoted to psychological aspects of marriage. But care has been taken to avoid the high-sounding jargon which has developed around this young science. New and difficult terms have made psychology appear to be a matter of teaching what everybody knows, in language which few can understand, or else a very convenient excuse for all kinds of faults. Many an expert worrier refuses to face up to trials because of some "complex" or other, real or imagined, most likely the latter. Confirmed "naggers" go on murdering love in the belief that hidden "conflicts" make them what they are.

It may be so. But it is a mis-use of psychology to throw it in front of one's faults like a smoke-screen. In this book we try to *use* it. And so far as ability to face up to the responsibilities of marriage is concerned, the one question which matters above all others is this: *Have you grown up emotionally?*

There are thousands of people who inquire anxiously about sex-adjustment and other parts of the married relationship, but very few appear to consider seriously this key question of personal emotional fitness for the responsibilities which marriage brings. They usually think of marriage in terms of "marriage," as though it were something distinct from the persons who marry. It is helpful to consider yourself as a human being, then to inquire how you are equipped to embark upon the long struggle which marriage involves. If the very thought of a long, shared struggle does not appeal to you, notwithstanding the rich prizes of happiness and mutual joys which can be won, then you are as unfitted for marriage as a person suffering from a physical disability which renders bodily union impossible. In other words, the ability to mate emotionally is as important as the ability to mate physically.

Apart from any feeling of repugnance with which we should recoil from such a spectacle, the very idea of a young child marrying an adult would strike us all as ludicrous. And so, indeed, it is. We can visualise the child, and can call up in the mind's eye the adult to which he is mated. We cannot see the invisible anatomy—the mental and emotional make-up of a person. If we could, we should find the marriage of an emotional baby to an emotionally-matured person equally absurd. Yet such marriages occur by the hundred every day.

If we tell a number of children that they may play with all the toys in a room except one, depend upon it there will be great interest in that one forbidden toy so soon as we leave the children to themselves. We all know that young children often want other children's toys. The emotionally immature remain very much in that same childish condition. You may walk down the street and observe a very attractive person of the opposite sex, arm-in-arm with husband or wife. If you are emotionally mature, you will note with pleasure that the person concerned is attractive; but, since he or she is attached to someone else, you will not start thinking of ways to start an affair with the interesting stranger.

Extreme emotional maturity has various manifestations. The absorption in self which is natural and necessary to the infant may be carried into adult life, with the result that every instinctive urge assumes an exaggerated importance in itself, without finding expression in socially desirable ways. The healthy young man who remains emotionally infantile may indulge his sexual appetite only with regard to the satisfaction of his own inclinations; he may, by the time he has attained the age of forty, have raised a population which could not be maintained on twenty times his earnings. When confronted by arguments against his selfish and unsocial conduct, he will probably loudly proclaim his faith in "sexual freedom."

On the other hand, the mature young man, equally strongly sexed, will realise that his own urges and feelings are not all that matters in this world, and he will act accordingly, exercising a reasonable degree of self-restraint. No doubt he, too, will have ideas about freedom, although he may not devote so much time to analysing and proclaiming them as will the less-matured type. He will know that sex is, in some respects, not unlike eating. We eat primarily in order to satisfy the biological requirements of our bodies; but in addition to serving this functional purpose, eating can, and usually does, provide us with pleasure. In precisely the same way, the matured person of either sex realises that both responsibility and pleasure have to be considered in connection with the satisfaction of the sexual instinct.

Needless to say, there are innumerable degrees of maturity; hardly any two persons, and perhaps no two persons, are equally free from infantile traits. But as the result of factors described elsewhere in this book certain infantile manifestations are exceedingly common at the present time. In one of his broadcasts in the series "Christian Behaviour," during the autumn of 1942, Mr. C. S. Lewis said this:

"You can get a large audience together for a strip-tease act—that is, to watch a girl undress on the stage. Now suppose you came to a country where you could fill a theatre by simply bringing a covered plate on to the stage and then slowly lifting the cover so as to let every one see, just before the lights went out, that it contained a mutton chop or a bit of bacon. Wouldn't

you think that in that country something had gone wrong with the appetite for food? And wouldn't someone who had grown up in a different world think that there was something equally queer about the state of the sex instinct among us? You find very few people who want to eat things that really aren't food, or to do other things with food instead of eating it. In other words, perversions of the food appetite are rare. But perversions of the sex instinct are numerous, hard to cure, and frightful."

Now the remarkable thing about many of those who regard an exhibition of the strip-tease kind as thoroughly enjoyable entertainment is that they feel that they are being very modern, "completely emancipated," by enjoying such things. If they had attained a genuine adult attitude to sex and to the human body they would see how ludicrous the whole thing was. The child's desire to find out the facts of the body of the opposite sex is natural and right; the adult's delight in watching a music hall artist disrobe is a result of the retention of the infantile outlook. Such acts represent a concession to the childish trait; what is generally forbidden is partly disclosed. And emotional babies of adult years experience a "thrill." It is the thrill experienced by the child who plays with the toy he has been told not to touch.

"But, surely," some will object, "modern psychology teaches that repressions are bad for us—that we ought to express our urges freely, otherwise we suffer emotionally." This question constantly crops up. There can be little doubt that many people use psychology as a defence for their own conduct, rather than as a guide to what their conduct should be. But there are others—and they are numerous—who are genuinely misinformed as to the psychological implications of "repression." Here it must be clearly and emphatically stated that psychology does not teach, and never has taught, that we should obey every impulse that comes over us, or seek to carry out every inclination we feel. The very idea is fantastic; yet the belief is widely held that if we do not obey every impulse, without hesitation, we shall suffer in some way. We shall certainly suffer badly if we *do* act on every impulse which seizes us!

Obviously, if we were to do that, we should immediately dispense with all considerations of morality. "I want to do this" would be sufficient justification for anything, regardless of the effect of our action upon other people, or even upon ourselves. The very fact that we are conscious of a desire to perform an action places that desire outside of the psychological realm in connection with which the term "repression" is used. For this psychological term relates to an *unconscious* process. And, surprising though it may seem to many people, including some writers and lecturers on the subject, that word means exactly what it says—unconscious. If we are conscious of a desire, and we say: "No, I will not do this," whether on moral grounds, or because on consideration you feel it would be unwise, our resistance to the impulse has nothing whatever to do with repression in the psychological sense.

There may be some things which, deep within our mind, are associated with painful or disagreeable sensations of the past, and these are rejected—kept out—of the conscious mind by a process which does not enter our consciousness at all. We are completely unaware of what is going on. It may take a psychologist a long time to unravel the precise process in any individual case, or, more accurately, to discover precisely the nature of the repressed material and the factors accounting for its repression.

Dr. A. A. Brill, the eminent psycho-analyst who translated many of Freud's works, once wrote: "I am compelled to say a few words of warning against those 'psycho-analysts,' or rather pseudo-analysts, who preach sex freedom, free sexual expression, and similar slogans. Unfortunately, we cannot prohibit anyone from calling himself a psycho-analyst, but I wish to say that neither Professor Freud nor any of his pupils ever advocated any such pernicious nonsense. As long as civilisation will endure, sex will have to be controlled, and only irresponsible imbeciles believe that one can run riot with sex."

Those are strong words. They deserve to be more widely known. Psychology, and psycho-analysis, have been used far too often as excuses for infantile lack of self-restraint.

The personal preparedness for marriage must include, then, an adult outlook on sex, and more—an adult *attitude* to sex which is one of the characteristics of emotional maturity. Those who have a sound attitude to sex are almost invariably well-balanced and mature in other respects. Men and women who have come to terms with their sexuality nearly always secure a sound adjustment to life generally.

The kind of person who flits from one love-affair to another is usually the type who finds it very hard, if not impossible, to carry any really difficult task through to its conclusion. We can easily test our powers of emotional control by ascertaining how we stand in regard to a number of life's activities. Do we tend to make many friendships which prove to be of very short duration? Are we frequently engaging in tasks which we fail to finish? Does some trifling rebuff or failure make us feel miserable for the rest of the day, or perhaps for a week? That group of questions, pondered over and honestly answered, will yield a flood of self-revelation.

There are others which are worth pondering, too. Here are some which are closely related to sex adjustment, that is, by our own adjustment to sex—not to another individual.

Am I capable of discussing sex matters much as I would any other subject? While reading some of the chapters in this book, have I felt that it was rather a pity that the romantic idea of love should be "debunked"? Should I like the idea of marriage better if the physical (sex) side were eliminated? The answers to such questions will reveal to you whether or not you are reasonably free from the influence of the romantic delusion.

Then how do you stand in relation to marriage itself? You may learn more about your real attitude with the aid of the following questions:

Am I just a little afraid of the responsibilities of marriage, or do I look forward with eagerness to accepting them? Does the fact that divorce has been made easier in recent years tend to make marriage rather more attractive in my view? Have I a lurking feeling that I am not capable of making a person of the opposite sex happy in marriage?

Often such questions are thought over for hours on end when it is too late, and when a marriage is proving unhappy. Far better to consider them in advance. Finally, it is as well to ask some questions designed to establish how one stands in relation to other people. If honestly answered, they will reveal childish traits which by deliberate effort can often be remedied to a large extent if not completely.

Do I deliberately dress in a manner calculated to draw attention to myself? Am I easily elated, and just as easily depressed? Is it hard for me to live

within my means? Am I constantly seeking the sympathy or praise of others? Do I tend to blame others when things go wrong? Do I often say things which, a moment later, I regret? Is it very hard for me to admit a fault? Am I a very jealous kind of person? Do my friends and acquaintances frequently offend me?

There is no need to dwell here upon the precise significance of "Yes" or "No" answers to these questions. The reader will appreciate, at a first reading, which answers indicate a measure of emotional immaturity, and will, therefore, gain a good deal of insight into his own points of strength and weakness. It should be added that there is no need to worry if consideration of these questions reveals many weaknesses. That is what they are for. They are designed to point the way to self-improvement.

The personal factor in marriage is vital because marriage at its best is friendship at its best, plus physical intimacy. The capacity for genuine adult friendship, with all that it implies in co-operation, sympathy, understanding, tolerance and loyalty, plus the ability to be a satisfactory sexual partner—these are the basic requirements. Included within these capacities, but worth stressing separately because of its great importance, is what I call, for want of a better term, the *will to love*.

It is, I know, difficult for many to conceive of a will to love. We have all grown so accustomed to the idea that love "comes" to us, that most people regard it solely as a power which seizes us from outside and compels us to look towards some one person of the opposite sex for emotional and physical satisfaction. It is not easy, therefore, to accept a measure of personal responsibility for the maintenance and growth of love. Yet experience and observation have convinced me that in this sphere, as in almost every other, a determination to succeed is extremely important.

Nowadays the emphasis is concentrated largely upon the "technique" of love—upon the knowledge we need in order to "make love" well, knowledge which is gained partly through experience within marriage. But that is not what I have in mind. Many people feel that whilst it is desirable for them to know all that they can learn about sex and about the psychological adjustment between partners in marriage, nevertheless they are dependent for their happiness in marriage upon the continuance of "love"—a power over which they have little or no control. That opinion, widely held, is dangerous. The old idea that people married "for better or worse," and that their union was intended to be permanent, had the advantage of throwing upon the partners themselves the responsibility for making their lives as happy as possible. And we need to accept that idea right at the start. Let two persons, coming together in marriage, be determined to make a sincere and if need be a protracted effort to give love a chance to flourish in their union, and that pair will be much more likely to attain married happiness than will a couple who feel that since love may depart at any moment, they must make the best of things while it remains, and, anyway, there is always divorce as a way out!

I am maintaining that love can be fostered. There are many people who have discovered this for themselves—and not by reading books! Some of them are men and women who have lost what has been called "the first, fine careless rapture." But they have been wise enough to look for what is lovely in the married relationship, which means looking for what is lovable in each other. They have sought to act in such a way that love was given its fullest chance

to flower in their lives. Sometimes, by patient, kindly attention to each other's traits, both good and bad, husbands and wives who have appeared to be poles apart in outlook and temperament have attained a degree of adjustment which has appeared to border on the miraculous.

In a book entitled *What Men Live By*, Dr. Richard Cabot devoted a chapter to marriage, in which he maintains that the standards of good sportsmanship, which appeal so strongly to men, are of immense value in the married relationship. He points out that a "good sport" takes much pride in succeeding in any adventure, and emphasises that the same spirit should be applied in the greatest adventure of all—marriage. The Will to Love, the determination to be a good lover in the all-round sense, will harmonise and co-ordinate the various elements in one's make-up so that the total personality is directed towards ensuring the success of the love-relationship.

CHAPTER VI

THE WIFE-HUSBAND RELATIONSHIP (PART ONE)

IN the French Chamber an impassioned Deputy once made a fiery speech calling for an improvement in the legal status of women. "After all," he cried, "there is very little difference between men and women!" At that the entire Chamber of Deputies rose. As one man they shouted "*Vive la différence!*"

Whether they all understood precisely how woman differs from man is another matter. Few men realise that a woman's sexual sensibility differs in certain important respects from their own. Less than sixty years ago a leading English physician, Acton, who was then regarded as an authority on sex matters, said that "the majority of women, happily for society, are not much troubled with sexual feelings."

That was a common impression in those days. Indeed, it was regarded as a vile aspersion to suggest that any woman was even capable of sexual desire. Wives had to be submissive. Any pleasure to be derived from sexual relations was a luxury reserved exclusively for the male!

Nowadays we know that sexual feeling is fairly evenly distributed between the two sexes. It is true that lack of sexual desire (frigidity) is more common in women than in men. But this does not mean that the basic sex urge inherently is absent. On the contrary, in recent years experience in dealing with cases of frigidity has been extremely encouraging, and in many instances the once "frigid" woman, as soon as the causes of her sexual coldness have been removed, has been able to participate happily and fully in the sex act.

Men usually are more aggressive sexually than women, and most women desire that they should be. Usually the man's sexual feeling is much more easily aroused than the woman's. But while the female generally is more passive and receptive than active and aggressive, her erotic urge is there just the same. The important point to note is that she, as a rule, requires preparation in the form of erotic excitation before she is ready for the final sex act, whereas the man's sexual feelings usually are directed towards the final consummation from the start.

Put in another way, it amounts to this: that the man is more quickly and easily aroused than the woman, and, if he does not deliberately prolong the act of union by restraining himself, he is likely to attain a climax in a comparatively short time. Thus, the woman may not have been sufficiently stimulated to bring her to the point where sex union is desired, and, after that, to orgasm. She may be left excited but not satisfied. As it takes a woman longer to become fully aroused, and thus prepared for the final sexual embrace, it is necessary for the husband to employ love-play sufficiently to ensure that his wife's erotic feelings are stimulated to the point where she ardently desires complete union.

It is worth stressing here a fact which is often overlooked, namely, that emotion and sentiment generally, indeed almost invariably, play a much larger part in a woman's life than in a man's. These certainly bring a more marked sexual response in a woman than in a man. Thus they must not be overlooked when we speak of preparatory love-play.

With the technique of sex—and it is important to recognise that there is a technique to be acquired—I have dealt in detail in *Love Without Fear*, so here I will quote what another writer says about this preliminary stimulation. In *Morals in the Melting Pot*, which is as interesting as any novel and of considerable practical value, the author presents a number of conversations on various aspects of sex. In one of them a Dr. Hansell talks to a young friend about the part of love-play in the sex act.

"Coitus should be regulated by the wife's feelings," he says, "not by the man's desires. To many men this is a new idea. They've been brought up to believe that because they make the running, they can run whenever they like. That is not so. The woman must invariably be considered first."

He goes on to say that the average man seems to think that the whole affair can be completed in a few minutes. Women, too, are terribly misinformed in these matters, and rely on their husbands, whose knowledge may have been acquired from a few well-meaning but unintelligent friends, or from prostitutes.

"The sex act can be divided into three stages: that of love-play, coitus, and rest. None of these stages should ever be omitted. Their length can be varied as occasion arises. A man should endeavour to provide variation. The sex act must never become stereotyped or it will soon degenerate into a mere physical exercise. Many a man fails to appreciate the fact that a wife needs arousing, and that it is his business to do this tactfully and skilfully. When a woman tells me that she has derived no satisfaction from the sex act, I often find that this is due to the man's inability to make love properly, and in nine cases out of ten he fails over the preliminary love-play."

The difference in the time taken over the sex act, in its two stages of love-play and coitus, may be the difference between a physical exercise and an act of love.

Ignorance or selfishness often result in a husband simply seeking to satisfy his own desire as quickly as possible with no regard for the fact that the woman's reaction-time is slower. For him, the whole act is over before the woman has even been aroused to a stage where she desires any form of union, let alone the final culmination. So she remains "cold" and unmoved. Her husband, probably, assumes from this coldness that she does not love him as he loves her.

Whether a woman can indulge frequently in intercourse and fail to attain orgasm without affecting her health is a much debated point. If it is frequently repeated, partial intercourse, in which the woman fails to attain orgasm, imposes upon her a strain and possibly emotional and physical suffering. It is, however, true that some women whose sexual impulse is weak, never attain orgasm, yet experience no harmful consequences. I am bound to say that in my experience the results are not nearly so bad as has been suggested. Often there are no discoverable ill results. I have been forced to the conclusion that, on the whole, the emotional and physical sufferings of women arising from this cause have been exaggerated, although undoubtedly there are cases where harm results.

The fact remains that the woman who fails to attain orgasm does not fully enjoy the sexual relationship. Many wives do not realise that they are not attaining all that sex relations should bring to a woman until someone explains to them what culmination, ideally, involves.

Those who recognise the importance of sex technique find it hard to believe what a vast amount of ignorance still exists. It is not by any means the otherwise ignorant who often are sadly unaware of the simplest facts about sex relations. Sometimes men and women holding highly responsible positions seek advice on the most elementary facts of sex relations. Whilst there are many who know little about love-play and the part it should have in the sex relationship, there are some who have no idea at all how the act of coitus should be managed. It has seemed unbelievable that they could be almost completely ignorant of the simplest facts concerning intercourse, sometimes after many years of married life.

It is clear from this that there is still a need for books which describe, simply and clearly, the plain facts about sexual practice. At the same time we must face the undeniable fact that there are many people, men and women alike, who have read every sex book they can obtain, yet are incapable of a successful love relationship.

The woman who enters marriage has a right to be wed in the true sense; in other words she is entitled to anticipate complete physical union with her husband. We have seen one doctor's opinion that in probably nine cases out of ten the sex embrace proves unsatisfactory because of the husband's failure to perform adequately his part in the preliminary love-play. With that view I do not quarrel. Where lack of knowledge, or absence of sex technique, is all that is wrong, the matter may usually be remedied quickly, especially if the couple concerned has not been married long.

But while lack of love-play undoubtedly is responsible for many marital failures, psychological factors must also be taken into account. They are much more important than was recognised at the time when Van de Velde and others were providing that quantity of material which did so much to enlighten the world on sexual difficulties.

We must face the fact that there are many women who, no matter what attempts their husbands make at stimulation, and no matter how skilfully and patiently they make them, cannot possibly respond because of deep-rooted inhibitions. Feelings of guilt associated with the sexual impulse may have arisen from faulty upbringing or from other experiences in early life—possibly in childhood. Such feelings may still all sexual activity. As soon as a woman experiences any sexual urge, she may immediately repress it as something

thoroughly undesirable. In such cases, love-play will merely intensify the feelings of disgust with which such a woman views anything relating to sex.

Happily, in a large number of cases where such feelings are not very deep-rooted a patient husband, a doctor, or a sex book may correct the evil results of faulty upbringing. More often, however, and almost invariably where the feelings of disgust are deeply rooted, psychological treatment is necessary.

But the real difficulty is that thousands of wives who never really enjoy sex relations, and many who experience nothing but unpleasant, or even painful, emotional reactions to sex activity, do not realise that they are in any way different from the genuinely mated. The wider distribution of sex books among all sections of the population undoubtedly has done much good in that it has caused many married people to realise what marriage should mean. After finding that there is something wrong with their own marriage, they seek advice or, where necessary, treatment.

One woman who had been married for several years sought a doctor's advice. She had read a book about sex and, in the light of what she had learned, had come to the conclusion that something was wrong—that her experience of the intimate side of marriage was unsatisfactory. An alert and active type of woman, she had resumed work in an office when her baby was two years old. She was, it appeared, a good housekeeper. Her home was "well run," and she was good at her work in the office.

"I think I've made a success of two jobs," she said, "and I can't understand why I've made such a mess of this other part of my life. My husband always seems satisfied, but I imagine that he realises that something is wrong. For my part, although I have had a baby, throughout the eleven years we have been married I have never felt the slightest pleasure in the sex side. No, I don't find it actually distasteful. I suppose I have felt that it was necessary—part of the price a woman must pay for marriage. The truth is that I'm just not *interested*. I remember that when we were first married I used to marvel that my husband seemed so keen about something which, to me, was dull and meaningless, except, of course, that it might lead to my having a baby, which was what I wanted."

As a result of her new knowledge she had talked the matter over with her husband, who had appeared to be very embarrassed and, indeed, had expressed astonishment that she had experienced no pleasure in the sexual embraces. She added that she had also talked the matter over with a married friend, a woman who worked in her office. This woman said that she had never experienced any pleasure in sexual relationships until after she had a second child. Could it be that her trouble would disappear if she had another baby?

The doctor was able to discuss the matter with the husband some days later. It appeared that the two had been firm friends for a number of years before marriage, had gone about together a good deal, and had enjoyed the same things. They were such "good pals," as he put it, that marriage seemed to be the obvious thing for them.

"I've never been one to give way unduly to sex," he said. "I've held myself pretty well in check, I think. Maud and I both have wide interests, and we realise that sex exists for a purpose. It has given us a lovely child. But now she has got the idea that there ought to be some pleasure attached to sex instead of our using sex for a definite end, having children when we want them. Of course, nature has made men want sex as a means of getting relief. But surely

women have a different angle, motherhood and all that, I've been wondering whether my wife has heard people talking a lot of advanced rot at her office. It worries me."

Deep in his mind was the idea that intercourse was something to be got over as quickly as possible—a means of meeting a sheer biological necessity, but nothing more. Advice about sex technique was wasted on him; he could not bring himself to indulge in love-play. "The whole idea disgusts me," he said. "I just can't bring myself to maul her about like that."

It would take us beyond the scope of this book to deal in detail with the process of inquiry and response which was necessary in order to get right down to the roots of the difficulties confronting this couple. Briefly, analysis revealed that the woman tended definitely towards homosexuality. While she could respond ardently to the friendly kiss of a girl friend, she was quite unmoved by the sexual approaches of her husband. As for the husband, re-education was necessary. He had to be brought to realise that, although his wife had had a baby by him, she was still, emotionally, a virgin. There had been no real emotional union. Physical union of a sort, yes; friendship within marriage, yes; but even when the final stage of coitus had been concluded, never once had there been complete abandon by the wife which is essential to perfect union. Instead, there had been only submission on her part. And the husband, anxious to act worthily towards his wife *because of his love for her*, was deliberately hurrying every sex embrace, with the result that "the supreme act of love" was reduced to nothing more than satisfaction on the husband's part against an unresponsive though submissive, and unmoved, because uninterested, wife.

Both in men and women, the nervous mechanism which controls the sex activities is extremely delicate; all kinds of thoughts, memories, vague feelings which are hard to pin down, can disturb its balance. Many a girl who has been "carefully brought up" has a vague belief that marriage is a beautiful state of close, "heavenly" companionship. Side by side with that idea of marriage, as something fine in itself, apart from what the partners may do or may fail to do, may go a feeling that there is something unpleasant about sex. The result is that however much in love such a girl may be, she may find it impossible to surrender herself completely in the sex act. And complete surrender is the only way in which she can bring the highest pleasure to both herself and her husband. Submission is not the same thing as surrender. Many a wife submits, but retains, deep within herself, an area which is not conquered, and which, indeed, is in fierce opposition to submission. She reasons that for the sake of comfort, quiet, or convenience, submission is the lesser of two evils.

Close union of mind and body, with the utmost co-operation at every level, from the sex foundation to the highest story of spiritual attainment—these are essential to the building of a happy, successful House of Marriage. And psychological factors often prevent this union of body, soul and spirit, this co-operation which affects every level of the shared life within marriage.

The shame which, even now, almost *seems* to belong to the very nature of woman, is a legacy of the past. But it cannot be swept away quickly or easily. Many a woman has felt, since early childhood, a certain feeling of dislike for men as men. The impression has been instilled into women in many ways that anything related to sex is to be feared, that the whole field of sexual expression is surrounded by dire dangers, and that a girl must exercise the greatest care or

sex will precipitate her downfall. They see in sex the cause of pregnancy, which again is surrounded by fears. And they see men as the instrument of sexuality. Vaguely, they tend to fear men.

In adult years they have, deep down within them, a vague feeling that they themselves are little more than mere objects created by nature to satisfy the sexual cravings of men, and so—through a thoroughly unpleasant process—to ensure the continuance of the race. They may feel that there are compensations if one marries the right man—male companionship—and also the satisfaction which maternity yields to most women. Even so, there is the deep, basic feeling of distrust, of fear, of inferiority, all blended in different proportions in almost every woman's emotional make-up.

The wife who would enjoy the sexual relationship to the maximum degree should adopt the right mental attitude to the whole matter, for it is absolutely essential that the state of mind should be one of readiness and, indeed, of pleasurable anticipation. While it is true that deeply-rooted fears, often springing from a level which is deeper than any conscious plane, may tend to make sexual union unpleasant if not impossible, it is equally true that the overwhelming majority of wives can contribute both to their own and to their husband's happiness by preparing themselves mentally for the act of union. Indeed, the wife owes it to herself, as she owes it to her husband, not merely to realise that union is desirable, not merely to accustom herself to the idea that it is necessary, but to look forward to it as something which can enrich her personality and increase her happiness.

As Dr. Helena Wright has well put it, "A wife who allows her mind to keep any unworthy ideas about sex lurking in its corners, is her own worst enemy. Her body will only yield its fullest joy, will only allow her to know the experience of physical ecstasy, if her mind and her soul are in active sympathy with it." Joyous anticipation is the right mental attitude to adopt, and it ought not to be difficult for most women. That it often proves difficult is due largely to faulty parental guidance earlier in life. Far too often the girl is given the impression that marriage on its physical side is full of terrors, or at best of inconveniences and unpleasant intrusions into "intimate" spheres, whereas it would help greatly if girls were encouraged to look forward eagerly to physical union as an essential, and rightly pleasant part of the marriage relationship.

The influence of faulty early training is certain to be felt. But it can largely be overcome, in the majority of cases, by deliberate mental preparation along the lines indicated, with consequent benefit not only to the wife herself, but to the marriage as a whole. To enjoy the full benefits which the free marriage can bestow we must ourselves be free, and to a very considerable extent we can free ourselves from some of the results of faulty early training, and of impressions of an unhealthy character acquired prior to marriage.

Finally, here is something which will help many wives who are conscious that they cannot practise that measure of abandon which is so desirable in the sex relationship, and who realise that the reason for this holding back is a feeling that it is not quite "nice" for a woman to display sexual emotion. In his introduction to the excellent little book by Dr. Helena Wright entitled *The Sex Factor in Marriage*, the Rev. A. Herbert Gray, M.A., D.D., says this:

"You have in you the capacity for responsive passion. Not one woman in a hundred is really without it. When you accept a husband he will hope to

discover that responsive passion in you so that you and he together may experience a mutual joy which nothing else can bring. If and when you attain to that experience, your full womanhood will for the first time have come to birth. You will look more alive. You will know a fullness of life and a general sense of inward harmony which will literally crown your existence.

"The idea that by taking wholehearted delight in love's embraces you will become a less spiritual person is entirely untrue. As a matter of fact, after you have attained to a harmonious sex experience you will find yourself more highly vitalised, and therefore more able to appreciate every lovely thing through which the beauty of God is revealed to us, and more able to respond to spiritual realities."

So much for what usually is regarded as the sex side of the wife-husband relationship. As I shall endeavour to show in the next chapter, however, a sound sex adjustment embraces a much wider scope than the purely physical. If here I devote some space to the wife's contribution to this fuller and more complete union, and seem, in doing so, to be preaching a little homily to wives, I refer to the following chapter as evidence that my views on this subject are by no means one-sided. Both husband and wife need to realise clearly that the sex relationship cannot properly be limited to brief periods of "coming together," but must consist of all the shared activities which marriage entails.

Dr. W. Stekel, of Vienna, who wrote a number of valuable books on the sex side of marriage, was careful to stress the importance of the wider aspect. "As a sex we are more disposed than men to dwell upon annoyances, to cherish small slights and worries, to waste energy in useless regrets. The cure for annoyances that are inevitable is to ignore them. The greatest matrimonial mistake any wife can make is to get into the grievance habit."

There is an old saying: *A kid glove, a fire and a man are three things that can be managed only by coaxing.* Every wife knows that this is true of the glove and the fire. Happy wives seem to realise intuitively that it is also true of men, and, therefore, of the man who matters most to them—the husband. Sometimes women express annoyance that this should be so. "Are men such spoiled creatures that they require constant coaxing and encouragement?" they ask. I am convinced that the answer is in the affirmative. For, truth to tell, men have a stronger feeling of inferiority than women. Some men have a marked feeling of inferiority towards women.

This is not difficult to understand when we bear in mind that for centuries this has been very much a man's world. In the past, men have had the best of almost everything. The best positions in the outside world, and absolute authority in the home have been theirs. In almost every sphere, from work on the land to high finance, and from waging wars to religion, they have reserved to themselves the exciting or better-paid posts. Woman's part has been the home and all connected with it—cooking, child-bearing and rearing, nursing, and so on. At worst, woman's lot has been one of slavish dependence upon man; at best, as "servants in the business of life, or a source of pleasure in its leisure," as an American writer, George Sherwood Eddy, has expressed it. The result of all this has been to make men more aggressive, more acquisitive, and more given to reasoning than women. The same conditions have had the effect of making women strong in intuition, more concerned with strategy than

force to gain their ends, and in many respects much nearer to the child than men. This is not surprising; women are what men have made them!

Yet although these effects of centuries of male domination appear, at first thought, to indicate inevitable feelings of superiority in the male, the truth is the exact opposite. The very fact that he has for so long enjoyed a larger measure of independence than women tends to make him anxious about his position and prospects, in business, marriage, everything. Outwardly he must appear confident; his success in life depends largely upon his conveying an impression of quiet confidence and efficiency. Yet all the time he is conscious of the heavy demands which life makes, and he feels the need for encouragement, and more—even for protection and comfort. Above all he feels the need for these things in marriage.

I have said that some men feel inferior to women. This arises from the fact that for a lengthy period, the most important and impressionable of his life, the male is completely dependent upon his mother. Is it surprising that this feeling of dependence, with the inferiority which accompanies it, often lingers on and is carried into adult life?

Of course, women often feel inferior to men—but for totally different reasons. It is true that the female child is as dependent upon her mother as the male child; but the mother is of her own sex, and thus the feeling of inferiority to the opposite sex is less likely to be produced. In these days of increased opportunities for them, women are very conscious of their abilities and their power to achieve much which in the past has been regarded as suitable only for men. Yet they find that many doors are still closed to them, and that the work of a woman, although precisely similar to that of a man working in the same building, is remunerated on a much lower scale. Such observations inevitably yield discontent. And often they are accompanied by feelings of inferiority arising from a realisation that, right from the start, the education of the boys in the family has been regarded as much more important than that of the girls, and that boys have come first in all considerations relating to contacts with the outside world.

Women's opportunities are widening, and we have to wait to see what women will do with them. At present, as has been said, "Women are the undiscovered continent of life, the area of highest potentiality of humanity. Man has had his innings; it is now woman's turn." It is certain that women can, eventually, make an immensely increased contribution to the common life. But adaptation to the changed conditions must inevitably take time. The full and equal co-operation of the sexes will not be attained quickly. But, within marriage, co-operation based on equality is attainable *now*.

This is true in spite of the fact that, in some respects, nature seems to have conspired against woman. It is, for example, true that in the physical experience of mating the facts seem to suggest male superiority. How often it has been said that "The man takes, the woman gives herself." The man is capable of taking possession of the woman without her being desirous of union, but the woman cannot participate in complete sex union with a man who does not desire it. The woman can accept physical union without in the least desiring it—accept it as a duty or in order to further some end she has in view. The man cannot do this. Is it surprising that not only men, but also many women, tend to feel that woman was made primarily to minister to man's satisfaction?

It is, I believe, basically important that the modern woman should get firmly in her mind and keep there the idea that she is her husband's equal. That involves, of course, acceptance of the idea of equal responsibility. The woman who studies her husband as a human being, notes his faults as well as his virtues, and determines to strive to order her own life so that at every stage she adapts herself to him, will do more to lift her marriage high above the average in happiness than is possible by any other means. The difficulty is in persuading wives that such deliberate adjustment is necessary and is not undignified.

It may seem that I have strayed somewhat from my discussion of sex-adjustment with which this chapter began. Yet, in truth, the whole problem of wife-husband relationship is a sex question. For purposes of convenience we speak of sex and love as though they were two separate things, just as we sometimes speak of the physical and the psychological. Yet so closely blended are they that no one can say where the one ends and the other begins. We know that love has its roots in sex. We know, therefore, that if the flower is to be a pure, beautiful thing, the root from which it springs must also be pure.

When sex grows up in us it finds its outlet in the whole range of shared activities in marriage. That is how sex flowers. But when it fails to grow, when its sole expression is found on the physical level, we have an instance of arrested development which, although different in kind, is similar in nature to the arrested growth which we find in homosexuality and in other deviations from the normal.

The miracle of love is that, although the strength of the root diminishes as the years pass, the flower grows stronger. There is no limit to its growth, but always there is an object towards which it moves in its expression of itself—the loved partner. Physical, intellectual, spiritual, the three levels upon which body, mind and spirit work, may all be dominated by love so that the words of that happy wife, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, are echoed anew:

How do I love thee? Let me count the ways.
I love thee to the depth and breadth and height
My soul can reach, when feeling out of sight
For the ends of being and ideal grace.
I love thee to the level of every day's
Most quiet need, by sun and candlelight.
I love thee freely, as men strive for right.
I love thee purely, as they turn from praise.
I love thee with the passion put to use
In my old griefs and with my childhood's faith.
I love thee with the love I seemed to lose
With my lost saints—I love thee with the breath,
Smiles, tears, of all my life!—and, if God choose,
I shall but love thee better after death.

CHAPTER VII

THE WIFE-HUSBAND RELATIONSHIP (PART TWO)

"If husbands would seek to understand the technique of love-making as thoroughly as they understand the mechanism of their cars, and wives took as much interest in the art of being responsive lovers as they do in that of being fashionably dressed, we would find ourselves living in a very much happier world."

These words of Dr. David R. Mace are worth pondering. And he goes on to say that the sex relation in marriage should become the sacramental expression of the communion which husband and wife have already reached on the mental and spiritual planes.

Here we get to the very roots of the free marriage as I see it. For in that coming together of two free persons with a view to working together in the *building* of a marriage, sex plays only a part of the whole, yet the whole is affected by it and enriched by it, while at the same time the sex expression itself becomes part of the deeper spiritual experience. Just as we find it impossible to separate psychology and physiology, since at every stage of development the physical changes invariably are accompanied by mental and emotional changes, so it is that in the ideal marriage, the sexual relationship is so closely blended with the mental and spiritual communion which exists between the partners that it is inseparable from them. It is only for purposes of explanation and simplicity that we discuss sex by itself, as though it were something separate.

There can, of course, be extremely strong ties of companionship, of shared intellectual interests, and of joint enthusiasm for great causes between two persons of opposite sex. Yet if reproductive physical union is absent, the basic principle of marriage is absent. On the other hand, two persons can marry and come together in physical union, and yet find themselves growing increasingly apart so far as companionship, shared interests, and other ties of heart and mind are concerned. The sexual relationship constitutes the essential difference between marriage and other forms of companionship. Yet, by itself, it cannot bring marital happiness. Only as a helpful part of the harmonious whole can it contribute effectively to the success of the partnership.

It is vitally necessary that we should recognise this fundamental truth. For it affects every phase of the life within marriage. Ordinarily, it does not fall within the category of sex technique, as it is treated by most writers on the subject. In separating sex from the other aspects of marriage they have tended to concentrate the spotlight on the part and so fail to bring out clearly its relation to the whole.

It is my firm belief that a sound understanding of "the technique of love-making" must include recognition of the fact that love-making occupies the whole of the waking hours. In its simplest form the sex act may occupy a mere two minutes, as we have seen. Where skilled love-making lifts the whole act to a higher level, and helps to ensure that the wife's needs are met,

it may occupy a comparatively short period of time. But rightly regarded, the sex act should *always* be in progress, in some shape or form. Even the simplest, most humdrum activities within marriage, should form part of the continuous love-relationship.

Thus it is clear that sex technique should be regarded as something much more comprehensive than the mere handling of the act of physical union, however skilful that may be. There are cases in which the husband playing his part of initiator wisely and well, succeeds in arousing in his wife an ardour which equals his own, and in which, indeed, everything proceeds very satisfactorily throughout the physical union. Yet afterwards the wife soon feels that, following an exalted moment, there has been a considerable fall. However well the sexual relationship—the physical embraces—may be managed by the partners, any success thus attained will tend to make the marriage relationship as a whole seem the more depressing and unsatisfactory unless the sex impulse, inspired by love, finds expression in *all* the activities of the shared life.

I think it will help the husband to see the force of all this if he will bear in mind that, generally speaking, it is his duty to play the part of initiator. In the actual physical union, from the preliminary caresses onwards, he almost invariably takes the lead, particularly during the early days of marriage. Nature seems to have decided that man should be the initiator. It is as well for the husband to accept this role, not only in regard to the physical embrace, but in all the many other activities of the marital union. He who does so will find that, just as thoughtful, skilled initiation in the physical relationship usually wins responses from his wife, so it is in these other spheres of marriage.

There are wives whose actual sexual experience, in the sense of the limited physical aspect, is satisfactory, yet who feel that their husbands, so expert in the erotic sphere, are exceedingly thoughtless, or clumsy, or both in all others. It is perfectly true that every wife needs to be courted and wooed afresh each time her husband seeks to unite with her in the physical embrace. What is rarely recognised is that it is erroneous to regard each "complete act of love" as something separate and distinct. It is rather like taking a single breath and, finding it satisfactory, saying that the person who drew that breath is a good breather. *Breathing*, not one breath, is what matters; *loving*, not one act of love, is what we have to consider.

Love embraces all, or it embraces nothing. It permeates every activity or it simply is not there at all. Love does not dole out its benefits in small chunks. Happy indeed is the husband who realises this and acts accordingly. Happy, too, is his wife!

Let me give an example from real life. A man who had been married for twelve years visited his doctor for a general "overhaul," and after the main purpose of the visit had been achieved, mentioned, rather reluctantly, that he was not altogether satisfied with the course his marriage was taking. The doctor cautiously remarked that a marriage did not take a course apart from that of the partners to it; that, if things were not going well, some change in the attitudes of one or both partners almost certainly was required.

"Well, Doctor," the man said, "my wife is a very attractive woman, but I'm perfectly certain that she's not particularly happy. I can't point to any specific sign, but I 'sense' that she feels just a trifle disappointed at the way things have turned out. She ought to be a very happy woman. I'm doing well, we have two wonderful children, and their future is well provided for. Yet we are drift-

ing apart—not, perhaps, to any alarming extent, but in a score of *minor* ways. The plain truth is that she is not as happy as I should like her to be, and I'm certain that she feels that marriage has not proved quite so satisfactory as she had expected."

The conversation continued as follows:

Doctor: "Many people who have been married a number of years experience precisely the same difficulty as you mention, but they often decide that things will right themselves and take no action. I advise you to determine, here and now, to decide upon a definite course of action to improve matters."

Patient: "About two years ago I first felt that things were not going quite as well as they should, and I blamed myself. About that time I bought several books on sex. I realised, after reading these books, that there was much more in sex technique than I had known previously, and I started to apply all I had learned. In fact, I think I can fairly claim that I carry out every bit of advice regarding the management of the sex act that the authors of these books recommend. But it doesn't seem enough."

Doctor: "Leaving out of consideration the more general aspects of your marriage, do you feel that the purely physical side is satisfactory? I mean, do both you and your wife find the sexual relationship satisfying, or is it a one-sided affair in which your wife does not fully participate?"

Patient: "The strange thing—or so it seems to me—is that my wife has tended to grow cold, to some extent, since I learned more about sex and tried to improve my own love-making methods. I honestly don't believe that my wife is held back by any false notions or marked left-overs from childhood. In fact, I should say that right from the start of our marriage she was exceptionally free from faulty ideas about sex and restraints arising from fears or a false sense of shame. Yet she seems—how can I put it?—more than a little irritated by the very steps which I take to ensure her happiness."

Doctor: "I suppose you are a very busy man? Does your business occupy more of your time than does most men's?"

Patient: "Yes, it does. Sometimes I have to be out of town for several days, and often I work late at the office. But, in spite of this, I devote a good deal of time to my wife, and I can assure you that I don't make the common mistake of rushing through the embraces of marriage."

There is no need to follow the conversation further. What policy was required to meet the situation? The advocates of sex technique in the narrower sense as the cure-all of almost every marital ill would have been astonished that an improvement in methods should have failed to yield an immediate improvement in the mutual happiness of this couple. What they tended to overlook, and what many still overlook, is the fact that, *guided by genuine love, the sex act is a continuous process throughout the waking hours.*

Because of the intense pressure of his business activities, the husband had practically confined his love-making to the bedroom. His wife could not share his general everyday round of activity; he could play little part in her round of day-to-day duties. But when it was explained to him that to a woman love is not, as for man, "a thing apart," but is her "whole existence," he soon realised how to adjust his sex technique so that it could meet the wider requirements of a woman's nature.

The first thing he did was to have a frank talk with his wife, and to accept the blame for having become so absorbed in his work that he had largely

neglected her. He told his wife that he realised that, although all his intense efforts in business had been intended ultimately to benefit her as much as himself, he felt utterly selfish when he reflected upon the starved existence she had been leading. "I've tried very hard to keep anything of a worrying nature from you," he told her. "But it would have been far better to have kept you acquainted with every fresh move in my business. After all, it's your concern as much as mine, and you should have been able to share the thrills which success has yielded, even though, at times, we should have had to share some rather anxious periods. That's where I've been wrong; I've not shared things with you sufficiently."

He was a wealthy man, and so he was able to do some things which many husbands cannot do. He arranged a separate banking account for his wife's sole use and saw that it was kept well nourished. Mentioning this to his doctor, he said: "If I want to take a taxi, I don't have to consult anybody. There's no need for me to ponder whether or not someone else will feel that I'm extravagant. I want her to feel equally free to spend money when she needs it, and to spend it exactly as she chooses without having to consult me in any way."

In all his efforts he was perfectly sincere. The same basic desire which in the first place had caused him to seek to improve his love-making methods, now found expression in a wider field, simply because his eyes had now been opened to the fact that a woman's love needs cover every part of the marriage relationship.

Not every husband can open a separate banking account for his wife. But this is only an illustration of the kind of action which women invariably appreciate. Quite trifling things which anyone can attend to often make a world of difference. They help a wife to feel that she is, indeed, loved—that she really does matter very much to her husband. Anything which reveals to her that she has her husband's trust is especially pleasing and that brings us, inevitably, to money.

Elsewhere in this book I deal with certain aspects of family finance, and here I do not wish to cover the same ground. But I must stress the importance to a wife of the feeling that her husband *admires* her capacity to manage money wisely and well. It is very desirable that she should be entrusted with money which she can manage in her own way. Far too many husbands assume that they alone are capable of managing money. I remember being told by a wealthy business man that it was much easier to make money than to keep it. Many a man who succeeds in making money is not nearly so capable of looking after it as is the average woman. The lives of many working-class families would be dismal indeed were it not for the fact that the wife contrives to make every pound her husband earns yield twenty shillings' worth of thoroughly sound value, and a little over for the savings bank. Women are usually superior to men in the wise expenditure of money. The shrewd husband who recognises this fact is likely not only to find that his wife will contrive to save where he could not do so, but that she will appreciate his recognition of that keen money-sense which many women possess.

The husband who would apply the wider sex technique will always be looking for ways and means of showing his wife that he loves her and has confidence in her. He will realise that a feeling of achievement and of self-confidence arising therefrom are as necessary to a woman's happiness as they are to a

man's. Common sense and, above all, a genuine, strongly-felt desire to act in this way, will themselves yield happy results. The best results, however, are dependent upon a deeper understanding of woman's needs than the husband usually possesses.

How can this idea of love-making throughout the whole of the waking hours be applied? The first essential is to devote as much thought to one's wife as to the mechanism of one's car. How does *she* work? What is there to be learned about *her* mechanism?

The nature of her sexuality is much more diffuse than man's. It is true that, like man, woman has a basic sex impulse, and that this may be as strong as man's. But her sexuality, to a greater degree than man's, finds expression in the general activities of marriage, including not only maternity and the care of children, but also the many activities connected with the running of the home.

Undoubtedly the advocacy of improved sex technique in the more limited sense has done much good, in so far as it has contributed towards the improvement of the physical relationship in thousands of marriages. But it is particularly necessary to women, and, although less directly, to men, that a sound relationship should be attained on other levels of the shared life.

How many husbands realise the need for a technique which embraces all the levels of a shared life? Very few. Yet it is only by deliberately striving to attain a sound adjustment on the mental and spiritual levels, as well as on the physical level, that *complete* union can be achieved. And here it is necessary to note another important difference between men and women—one which rarely receives adequate consideration from either husbands or writers on marriage. It is the difference in mental *method*, if I may so put it, between men and women.

Many a man complains bitterly that his wife will not attempt to reason things out. Many a wife feels that her husband is *all* reason, able to argue about anything under the sun, but never able to go straight to the truth as she feels she can. The truth is that, generally speaking, men are rational, and women intuitive. It is important to recognise that fact, and act on it.

A woman's feelings usually are her guides, and they often prove to be exceedingly sound guides. Indeed, men frequently are amazed to find that women, who "never reason things out" nevertheless seem to "sense" the right answer to many a problem of life or conduct, or, perhaps more accurately, to any problem which really interests them. There is bound to be a certain measure of conflict between the average woman's intuitive approach and the more rational attitude of the average man.

Needless to say, women are not "all intuition," any more than men are entirely rational beings! There are women whose make-up includes an almost "masculine" approach to life. There are men—especially those with artistic gifts—who possess marked intuitive tendencies.

If the husband will keep this fact in mind, it will help him to avoid one basic error which yields an immense amount of disagreement and friction. It is using cold reasoning to overcome anything which he cannot understand in his wife. A woman who feels deeply about something or other—it may be only a trifling matter, but to her it seems important—may well feel like screaming, and indeed may do so, if she is confronted with a series of arguments, however logical. Indeed, the more impressive the arguments the more irritating they are

bound to be. Why? Because they reveal how much hard thinking the husband is prepared to undertake in order to oppose what his wife desires.

There is, then, a gulf; and the wise husband will try—nay, will determine—to bridge it. He will realise that *he* attaches value to reason because it is a masculine attribute, and that woman's intuition is part of woman's basic make-up, and must therefore be respected. He will accept the undeniable fact that it is a quality which often yields flashes of genius scoring where cold reasoning misses the mark.

No, the wise husband will not assume that his arguments are necessarily superior to the intuitive feelings of his wife. He will seek to *understand* his wife, not try to make her reason as he does. The greater the understanding the deeper the admiration. There will grow, too, a feeling of wonder that this gift of intuition can so often solve in a flash problems which a reasoning brain can work on for hours without seeing a ray of light!

After all, the husband has married *a woman*. Why should he expect her to feel like, act like, or reason like a man? What could be worse than that she should do these things? Yet many husbands judge their wives entirely by masculine standards, and say in effect (though not in words, because then the absurdity of it would be clear), *Be a man!* If a man's whole attitude to his wife is determined by her success or failure to act or think like a man, all the knowledge in the world will fail to ensure harmony.

Every problem is an emotional problem to a woman. She hopes for sympathy and understanding; and she expects to obtain these from her husband. She is fortunate if she receives them in satisfactory measure.

For the attainment of a sound sex technique in the full sense it is necessary, then, for the husband to realise that his wife is different from himself not only physically, but emotionally, and that, in very truth, love is her whole existence. Once he realises that, he will see the necessity for playing a lover's part on all the levels of the shared life.

It is a big task. To attain mutual adjustment on every level of being is something much too big to achieve in a week, a month, or a year. It is a great ideal, and no ideal worthy of the name is easily attained. But the husband who deliberately sets out to perform his role of initiation, not merely in the physical embraces, but in all the activities of the marriage communion, will call forth from his wife varied responses which no purely physical stimulation could possibly bring. Sex will then assume its rightful place within the marriage.

CHAPTER VIII

WOMAN'S CLAIM TO SEX EQUALITY

"THE right to joy cannot be claimed in the same way as one claims the right to put a voting paper in a ballot box. A human being's erotic aptitudes can only be developed where the right atmosphere for them exists, and where the attitudes of both persons concerned are in harmonious sympathy. That is why the erotic rights of women have been the last of all to be attained."

Thus wrote Havelock Ellis in his essay on "The Love-Rights of Women," which is included in his *Little Essays of Love and Virtue*. He had pointed out earlier that women's social, economic and political claims had long been before the world. Women themselves had actively asserted them. All were in process of realisation. But "the erotic claims of women, *which are at least as fundamental*, are not publicly voiced, and women themselves would be the last to assert them."

Since that book was published, in the 1920's, some women have been less reluctant to discuss the subject of women's sex rights. Indeed, Havelock Ellis's work undoubtedly caused some women to inquire into the subject. No doubt what they learned surprised and troubled them. The profoundly unsatisfactory experiences of many wives, and the fact that only a small proportion of wives attain to anything like the highest joys which the sex relationship inside marriage can yield, revealed beyond doubt that much was wrong. They realised this, and it disturbed them. Even so, they devoted little attention to the position of the woman *within* marriage. Instead, their efforts were devoted mainly to ensuring that the benefits which marriage could and should bring, were available to all women.

They pointed out that there was a considerable surplus of women in the population, and that, in consequence, some women inevitably would have to go through life with no prospect of satisfying their instinctual urges towards sexual expression and towards maternity unless they were willing to pay the penalties which society imposes upon those who defy its conventions. "The problem of the surplus woman"—a term I have never liked—was much discussed after the first world war when it presented itself in peculiarly acute form, since so many of the flower of manhood had been lost in battle.

To these reformers, then, the "love rights" of women were the right to sexual expression and the right to motherhood. They demanded that unmarried women should be able to enjoy these rights without social stigma or legal disabilities.

With the various proposals which sprang from this discussion I am not here concerned; for the most part they consisted of suggestions for some form of "near marriage" relationship which would be recognised by society and by the state, and which would—to put it rather brutally—"share out" the available man-power. What we need to recognise is that the "love rights" of women are not necessarily attained by marriage; that, indeed, many married women experience no erotic pleasure whatever through physical union. It follows, therefore, that if the love rights of women are to be asserted the position of married women is of great importance, since the majority of women marry.

Here I am concerned with the love rights of women within the free marriage. I think that it is remarkable that women have been slow to assert any claim to sexual satisfaction *within* marriage. Surely it is significant that although a number of books have been written in which the sexual needs of the wife have been stressed, most of them have been written by men.

In a relationship which is based upon equality, as the free marriage is, there must clearly be equality of "rights" in the realm of sex. Husbands claim certain rights, as we all know. The phrase "exercise the rights of a husband" has become a cliché. But we rarely hear of wives claiming their sex *rights*. Even at gatherings of women who devote much thought to marriage problems

there is a marked reluctance to discuss this matter. In spite of the flood of enlightenment upon sex which has done an immense amount of good in recent years the overwhelming majority of wives accept what comes to them for all the world as though they had no rights at all in the sphere of physical intimacy within marriage, and as though it would be highly indecent even to consider that they had any such rights.

Have wives any "rights" in the realm of sex? Or should they, having married "for better or worse" (just as men do, for that matter!) be content with what comes to them? What are those "erotic claims of women" to which Havelock Ellis referred? Are they really "at least as fundamental" as other rights—economic, political, social? Such questions as these are usually avoided by writers on sex. They should be faced, fearlessly and frankly, for they are of the utmost importance to millions of married women, and—a little less directly—to millions of married men.

In his interesting book *A Plea for Monogamy*, Dr. Wilfred Lay says that "the world is made up of the unmarried, the truly mated, and the ill-assorted thirds." The last include all married people who are not truly mated. Unfortunately, we have to face the undeniable fact that a very large number of unions are in this category. Where this is so, the husband may or may not be aware that he is missing the highest joys which the physical union in marriage should bring. The wife, on the other hand, almost inevitably experiences feelings of dissatisfaction which, in time, may yield various distressing results.

It is no exaggeration to say that the *majority* of wives never experience the measure of satisfaction which should be theirs through the physical embraces of marriage. Various authorities in Britain and in America have estimated that some seventy per cent of wives are mentally and physically aroused without being satisfied. In these cases, the sex relationship is one-sided. The husband secures satisfaction—though not the highest degree of pleasurable sensation—since that is dependent upon responses from the wife yielding with joy and abandon.

If consideration for each other is to be the basic principle of marriage, as it must be in the free marriage, it must not be limited to the little courtesies of life, the marks of affection which can be seen and noted by the outside world. It must include the physical relationship. Far too often the superficial, visible kindness which seems to outsiders to mark a happy marriage cloaks a dismal routine of one-sided sexual activity in which the husband fails to play his part as lover and merely achieves his own purely physical satisfaction. The sex embrace may leave the woman entirely unmoved. On the other hand, she may experience feelings of disgust and irritation. It may seem to her that so far as the physical side of marriage is concerned, she is merely a medium through which her husband can attain satisfaction in which she is not allowed to participate. Or she may be aroused mentally and physically and left unsatisfied, and while her husband sleeps deeply and contentedly, she may lie awake troubled by the stirrings of unfulfilled desire.

The essential point to bear in mind is that the wife requires satisfaction equally with the husband. That is the "love right" of every married woman. Every wife ought to take steps to secure it. Every husband ought to ensure that his wife secures it.

Those wives—and there are hundreds of thousands of them—who go for years without once attaining complete satisfaction in the sex act, although they may have “participated” in coitus frequently, are, in truth, unwed. They are unmarried in the physical sense. This problem of the unmarried wife has received far too little attention in the past. Its solution is of vital importance if we are to strengthen the institution of matrimony by ensuring that it yields the great enrichment of life for which it was ordained.

Before we look forward, it would be well to look back; before we consider how women shall find in marriage the genuinely complete fulfilment of their sexual needs, it would be desirable to ascertain how their present position in marriage, and their present outlook upon marriage, have developed. Contrary to an impression which exists in some quarters, they are not the result of a deliberate conspiracy on the part of men to keep women in subjection. To a large extent efforts to protect and benefit women have been responsible.

The man has come to be regarded as the head of the family, responsible for the welfare and maintenance of his wife and children. This has resulted in various economic developments which have tended to relieve the wife of responsibility and to make her dependent. With little economic power, and, until recently, with no political power, women have played a subordinate role in almost every field of activity outside the home. The rigid insistence upon strict fidelity on the part of the wife, unaccompanied by the same strict demand upon the husband, has been another factor which has tended to make women accept their lot with submissiveness and resignation. For centuries society and the law treated women as dependent, rather than as self-disposing individuals. Is it surprising that they *themselves* have tended to adopt the same attitude?

With the rise of industrialism many women were able to leave the home for the factory and to earn their own living instead of being completely dependent upon fathers or husbands. Inevitably, this measure of economic freedom influenced thought and behaviour. Girls were able to leave home and to embark upon careers and thus obtain a much more varied experience than their mothers had thought either right or possible. As a result of this economic self reliance the more thoughtful women soon acquired a new outlook towards men and marriage. Able to meet men on equal terms, they increasingly disputed the old conception of man as Lord and Master. The banners of “Women’s Freedom” were raised. Women began to march in battalions to claim political rights. Once they had been won, women realised that political freedom was not an end in itself, but a means to other ends. They made further demands for a larger measure of economic freedom, equal pay for equal work, and the abolition of the marriage bar in various professions. Claims have also been advanced in certain quarters for an improvement in the status—particularly the economic status—of the married woman.

All these demands were, and are, part of a single claim for equal rights with the male. For the most part the demands have been, and still are, political and economic. Only to a small extent has sex entered into them. The post world war demand, that all women should have an outlet for the satisfaction of sexual and maternal needs, was that of only a small minority of women. It shocked the majority, or at best, merely afforded them an interesting subject for discussion.

To-day, the position is much the same. The majority of women do not assert claims to sex rights. But the minority, the active thinking minority, must not be dismissed as unimportant. Because it does act and *does* think, it exercises a degree of influence far beyond what must be expected from its comparatively small numbers. The feminists who carry their claim to complete equality with the male into the realm of sex have nailed the slogan "Sex Freedom" to their mast. In so far as they assert that the principle of the complete equality of the sexes should be recognised, their claim is in line with the conditions of free marriage. But they appear to make one grave mistake—that of assuming that because the sexes are both equal, they must be treated exactly alike. This false assumption carries them to extreme proposals which cut right across the free marriage.

Men and women are not alike; they are different from each other, and it is necessary that they should be. The retention by each sex of its sex characteristics is of the first importance. Sexual freedom, which, in blunt terms, merely means promiscuous intercourse, emphatically is not in the best interests of women in general. There may be—indeed, we know that there are—intersexual types of women. These can—and, in fact, usually do—behave very much as many men do, taking "love" where they find it, and remaining (outwardly, at least) untroubled by their promiscuous behaviour. That such women are genuinely as free from feelings of remorse as their outward demeanour suggests is open to doubt. But even if they are unhaunted by conscience, and totally unaffected by the grim view which society in general takes of them, the fact remains that they are exceptional. Sexual promiscuity is entirely foreign to the true feminine nature.

The old "double standard" of morality had its origins in the patriarchal family system. It was necessary then that a man should have sons not only to continue his line, but also to perform certain religious duties. In order that a man could be certain that his offspring were really his own, the strictest chastity was demanded of the woman. The man, on the other hand, was free to indulge in sexual intercourse outside of marriage, although there would be trouble if he infringed upon the rights of another man. Throughout the centuries, much the same system has operated. In recent years it has, of course, been subjected to a great deal of strain, especially as women have attained a greater degree of economic and social independence, and as the increase of knowledge of contraceptive methods has made it easier for them to indulge in sexual intercourse outside of marriage without undue fear of the consequences.

Now, on the face of it, nothing seems more reasonable than that some women should argue, as they do, that if the demand for equality of the sexes is to be pressed to its logical conclusion it must include the right to as much freedom in sexual relationships as men have always claimed for themselves. These women contend that since women experience the sex urge just as strongly as do men (a fact which was not established until comparatively recently) women should be as free as men in the sphere of sex relations.

One can well understand why some women feel that they owe it to their sex not to overlook any rights, whether theoretical or practical, which men have claimed or exercised. "What men do, that we shall do!" is the attitude. "We have social and political equality with men. Let us march forward to our next goal—complete sexual equality." "The two sexes are equal; *the time has come when they must be treated exactly alike!*"

The last sentence, more than all the others, expresses exactly what is in the minds of the feminist advocates of sexual freedom. It sounds completely reasonable, simple, fair. Yet it represents a dangerous fallacy. For the sexes are not alike. They never have been, and—let us hope—never will be alike! Recognising that men and women are equal is by no means the same as saying that they must be treated exactly alike in everything. That, indeed, is impossible. The feminist cannot hope to enforce male motherhood, for instance—a point they tend to ignore, but rather an important one if the sexes are to be treated *exactly* alike!

Extreme feminism definitely has an element of childishness. The male has certain toys; the woman must have them. The male plays with fire; the woman must play with fire. What is overlooked is the fact that the male who plays with fire often gets burned. Not only will women who play with the same fire get burned; they will be burned much more seriously. For woman's whole nature is fundamentally opposed to promiscuity.

Do the men who flit from bough to bough gain thereby? Are they happy? From much observation of the consequences of promiscuity I can say that usually they are extremely unhappy. Always they are searching and not finding. Always they are striving to discover their ideal woman. They are in love with love, in the sense that they feel that satisfaction can be secured only by means of a sound love-relationship. But they feel this vaguely. They never reason it all out, but go blindly from one woman to another, and find no real, lasting satisfaction anywhere. Increasingly, as time passes, and as the constant experimenting tends to become monotonous, they become depressed. Indeed, some become desperate.

It is a poor "right" to set before women—the right to become not merely like these unfortunate male infants, but even worse, since not only is the normal woman's nature opposed to promiscuity, but all the odds, economic, social, even *physical*, are against it. If we consider woman's sexual needs along purely physical lines, with the psychological aspect kept almost out of the picture (the physical and emotional are so closely blended that it is impossible entirely to separate them), we find that woman's needs are different from those of a man, and that the "love-and-run" method cannot satisfy them.

The women who demand sexual equality in the sense of sexual freedom are not ignorant; they are usually among the best-informed and most brilliant of their sex, all of which tends to make their propaganda the more dangerous. Why is it that such intelligent, and often gifted, women strive to lead their sex astray in a direction which all experience of the past, as well as present-day experience in doctors' consulting rooms and psychologists' clinics, shows to be ruinous to women's best interests?

There can be but one answer. These leaders of women—so far as women *have* leaders, for in the main they do not follow their sex—feel very deeply the injustices against their sex which have been handed down from the past. Because they are intelligent they feel the more keenly such inequalities between the sexes as still remain. The emotional response is one of bitter protest, and like so many emotional manifestations it assumes a destructive rather than a constructive aspect. Pull down, rather than build up, is the aim. At all costs the structure of male monopoly must be brought crashing to the ground. The unfairness of some male "privileges" is emphasised so that the effect which the same "freedom" would have upon women, and *does* have upon those who

exercise it, is overlooked. If we were to ignore some of the deepest emotional needs of women and accord them a right that men claimed or exercised they would only suffer in consequence.

It would be far better for women to realise that promiscuity has not brought happiness to man, and that it holds fewer possibilities of happiness for women. It would be better, too, for women to say: "It is grossly unfair for you men to claim the right to sexual adventures outside of marriage when you deny the same right to us. Be fair. You say we should be chaste. Play the game and live up to the ideal you set for us." That—and it is what the majority of women, the great mass of women, say—is unanswerable. It is in line with man's own conscience. A man who hears women demanding sexual freedom knows that they desire to sell their own birthright for a mess of pottage. But the challenge, from women to men, to live up to an ideal, is compelling because men's own experience of life reinforces it.

Women have every reason to reject the double standard of morality. But they stand to lose if they insist upon the right to step down to a lower level simply in order to be on the same plane with men, or with the more emotionally immature among men. Why should they not seek equality on a higher level by insisting that men should rise to the standard normally accepted by women? Why should women choose to step down when men could, with advantage to both sexes, step up?

The demand that the "love rights" of women should be granted along the lines of sexual freedom is based on the erroneous assumption that "love" and "sex" are synonymous. They are not. If we eliminate love, sooner or later men and women must inevitably fall to something like the animal level. The old morality, with its double moral standard, its one-sided view of sex, and its conspiracy of silence regarding sex, had faults enough; but it also had certain merits which are likely to be overlooked. Chief among them were the manner in which it guaranteed the continuance of the family and the home, surely two of our most precious possessions. And, in spite of the romantic illusion which accompanied it, so closely that it seemed almost part of the system itself, the old morality did place stress upon the importance of love.

"The new morality," which is the term used to dignify the demand for sexual freedom, treats love and sex as being one and the same thing. Consider the sex act. Taken by itself, simply as a physical embrace, is there anything beautiful or ennobling about it? Unless love enters into it, there need be no tenderness, no regard for the other's feelings, no attempt at mutuality. In truth, sexual desire and its satisfaction are not necessarily connected with love at all.

As Dr. David R. Mace puts it in his excellent little book, *Does Sex Morality Matter?* "In its primal state sex knows nothing of tenderness. It is in the secondary sexual manifestations that we encounter these refined qualities. When nature has brought male and female past the preliminaries to the physical act itself, she is done with enticements. All is now concentrated on the great practical purpose—the union of sperm and ovum. The impulse becomes a craving, urgent and clamorous. It develops, as one writer puts it, into 'a kind of frenzy.' There is no gentleness and no altruism about sex in the raw."

The sex freedom which is demanded as the love right of women is an extension of sexual promiscuity at the expense of love—"sex in the raw" set against the building, step by step, of that structure of shared joys, troubles, successes and failures, which is marriage, and in which love grows. The woman is

told, in effect, that men have been promiscuous in the past, and that in these days of sex equality she must insist upon doing precisely the same. Here, surely, is an example of what psychologists call over-compensation.

The fact that nowadays many women can often afford to bring up children themselves does not alter the truth that the child needs two parents. The new morality, based upon sexual freedom, conveniently overlooks this. Under the old morality, with all its faults, a woman knew precisely where she stood in this matter. The man who became her husband, and eventually the father of her child, shared the task of upbringing with her.

Sexual freedom involves the placing of a heavier burden than ever upon women. It means that they are free to offer to men, and to receive themselves, whatever pleasure may be reaped from sexual relations; but those to whom they offer themselves in this way are freed from responsibilities such as that of parenthood.

In his book *Sex and Sense* T. W. Pym says: "To the man, sex is just one act." On the other hand, "to the woman, it is a complicated series: courtship and wooing, sex act, conception, gestation, and pregnancy, childbirth, lactation and maternity. It is impossible that she should submit to the first two of these, cut off the rest by birth-control, and yet remain unchanged. The change chiefly consists in a great increase in the desire for sexual intercourse. To many this is conscious. I have discussed this particular point with many a woman who has done the thing and they have all at once agreed, without any argument, that they were so changed."

Dr. Mace quotes this passage and adds: "There is no doubt as to the truth of this. Even when women have been raped by men, it has often been enough to set up an insatiable hunger for a repetition of the experience." Prof. Ray E. Baber quotes a case in which a white woman of culture married a coarse negro "because, having once in a foolish moment had intercourse with him, she thereafter became 'a slave to his sexual powers.'" Here it should be remarked that many negroes are charming, cultured people, and that there are many coarse and thoroughly unpleasant men whose skins are white.

It would be easy to quote other instances. Not all women are alike. But it is safe to say that a single act of intercourse, which might be a mere incident in a man's life, might be of the deepest significance to a woman.

Is this sexual freedom, then, which makes a cultured woman the slave to the sexual powers of a coarse, gross man? Dr. Mace, whose book contains one of the most effective answers to the "New Morality" so far published, maintains that "promiscuous intercourse does violence to the true sexual nature of woman." After relating instances such as those mentioned above, he says: "Behold, therefore, the great illusion by which feminism is lured to betray its own cause! First, woman demands complete equality with man. Then she includes sex equality. Trying to behave like a man, she is defeated by the law of her own nature. Finally, she discovers that, instead of achieving equality with man, she has placed herself in the most abject slavery to him. She has played into his hands by allowing him to awaken within her a craving which she is willing to satisfy entirely on his terms."

Not is this all. As we have seen, for most women the sex relationship is more than a single act; it is a long series, with the sexual and the maternal, and the idea of a home and family, all inextricably linked together. "Raw sex" does not meet her needs. That alone leaves her unsatisfied, though it can

arouse within her the strongest desires. What can she do when, having chosen the path indicated to her by the advocates of sexual freedom, she finds herself the victim of strong desires which cannot be satisfied completely in the "free" state which she "enjoys"? What can she *do*? Alas, nothing.

From the psychological standpoint the condition of such a woman is extremely unsatisfactory. That is why so many experimenters in sexual freedom bring their problems of emotional slavery to the doctor and to the psychologist. Deep down within themselves, if not openly, they confess that they themselves made the choice which brought them to their dire condition. They envy other women who, within the borders of marriage, go on from the sex act to the completion of the whole series, thus satisfying their deep maternal instinct and finding joy in the life of the family. They know that they can blame no one but themselves for their condition—a fact which does little to help them. And, above all, they experience the hopelessness which sits heavily upon those who realise that they are in desperate straits and who know, too, that there is *no remedy*.

Sometimes, of course, there are other complications. The woman who, when young and attractive, chooses sexual freedom, sometimes finds a lover who fills her economic as well as her sexual needs. But later, with her attractiveness going or gone, she may be left without either sexual or economic consolation.

Even if we could make some financial provisions for the woman who treads the "free" road—and that, surely, would be very difficult—there is no means known to man for resolving the emotional conflict, the self reproach, the unequal struggle with conscience, which are the consequences of sexual freedom. Those who talk glibly of the joyous freedom from inhibitions which will result from sexual freedom talk arrant and dangerous nonsense. And thus it is that if sexual freedom is to be advocated as among the love rights of women, those who are most familiar with the dire results to which it leads have the plain duty of stating, clearly and emphatically, that what is claimed is the right to go one's own way to emotional misery and, very likely, to conflicts within the mind which may lead to a serious breakdown in health.

Complete sexual freedom is, of course, impossible, save perhaps to a dictator who is in a position to insist that all others do exactly what he desires. The nearest approximation to it "has existed in the harems of Eastern potentates, where freedom for the one has involved virtual slavery for the many."

We need not pursue further the wisdom of claiming as a right a measure of freedom which can best be enjoyed within the strict confines of a harem. It is indeed remarkable that those who have altered the eleventh commandment, "Thou shalt not be found out" to "Thou shalt brazen it out," and who glory in their daring in the great cause of freedom, should be leading us into a promised land which resembles a harem. But we may well inquire whether, within the boundaries of the free marriage, woman cannot secure a degree of satisfaction, both erotic and otherwise, far beyond that which is customary to-day. Instead of discarding marriage, or of setting up an opposition shop to it, full of apparently cheap wares which, in the long run, prove costly, we might well try to ascertain whether the benefits of the old morality, with its regard for the home and family, cannot be maintained together with a considerable improvement of the quality of the sexual life within marriage.

In order to do this we might well recall the words of Havelock Ellis with which this chapter opened. "A human being's erotic aptitudes can *only* be developed where the right atmosphere for them exists, and where the attitudes of both persons concerned are in harmonious sympathy." The right atmosphere is, unquestionably, that of the free marriage, where both partners know well the part they should play, are free from extreme infantile fears and aggressiveness, and are prepared to co-operate to make a success of marriage in all its aspects. "Harmonious sympathy" will be found there, and the "right atmosphere" will permeate the whole union.

We shall go further into these matters in the chapters which follow. But there is one sound rule, arising out of what has been said in this chapter, which is worth stressing here. It is a love right of women which is rarely recognised, yet it ought to be constantly in mind by students of marriage, by husbands, and by wives.

It is this:

The right of every woman to recognition that her sex needs are different from those of a man.

The "New Morality" conveniently ignores this fundamental fact and the right which goes with it. In the average marriage of to-day, imperfect realisation of the fact results in failure to take all the action which woman's special needs demand. Yet this recognition, together with the action which it implies, are among the most important secrets of the happy marriage.

CHAPTER IX

THE "FREE LOVE" FALLACY

AFTER the case of *Rex versus Eustace Chesser* had been concluded, with a verdict of "Not Guilty," some curious things happened. People assumed that because I had been the defendant in a case involving a sex book I must necessarily hold the most extreme views. Indeed, in some respects I appeared to have been "branded" as I would have been had the case been lost. Some people thought badly of me. Others hailed the verdict as if it were the beginning of a new age of licence!

One dear old lady approached me, more in sorrow than in anger, and begged me to be patient while she explained why she could not approve of much that had been written in *Love Without Fear*. I listened to her for some time while she pleaded with me (on behalf of thousands of young people and of millions yet unborn, I gathered) to abandon the dangerous doctrine of free love! It was quite apparent that she had not read the book.

I leaned forward and spoke quietly, as though what I had to say was hardly fit for the walls to hear. "Free love, madam, is not new. It is played out. I advocate something entirely different—*bought love!*"

If I had announced that I had just committed a murder and followed it with a performance of cannibal rites, the good woman's face could not have registered a greater intensity of horror. It was grand! She had asked for it,

and she should have it. "Yes," I murmured thoughtfully, "people only appreciate what they pay for; therefore I advocate bought love."

"Prostitutes!" she gasped. "You believe in prostitutes!" "Of course I believe in them," I answered, "just as I believe in anything else I have seen with my own eyes. But I do not wish to see any extension of prostitution, which undoubtedly is an evil, though one which will never be abolished by mere denunciation or by any state action. No, it is impossible for men to buy love from a prostitute. At best, the relief of physical tension is all that the prostitute can offer to her clients. She is not in the market to sell love. Love costs something which money cannot buy. I believe in bought love in the sense that there is a price to be paid for love. And one of my main purposes in life, and one of the reasons I wrote *Love Without Fear* was to show people what that price is, and encourage them to be prepared to pay it."

By the time I had finished this brief explanation the woman's face was glowing. "Then you don't believe in prostitutes after all?" she asked. "Of course I believe in prostitutes, just as I believe in other things I have seen, and in a good many things which I have not seen, provided that there is ample evidence that they exist. I do not believe in ghosts. But I do know, as you know, that there are prostitutes. Therefore, we *both* believe in them."

This woman's trouble, of course, was that she had read in one of the newspapers part of the evidence regarding the statement in *Love Without Fear* that it was undesirable for prostitutes to possess a sex technique sounder than that of most wives. This she had construed, as others had sought to do, as an attack upon wives in general. Anyway, she had the goodness to apologise for her mistake, and she added: "Actually, young man, I think you mean well!" which, I imagine, was high praise!

But that episode set me thinking. It caused me to study the subject of free love, and to learn what the advocates of its various forms had to say. Having done that, I soon came to the conclusion that free love is not a new proposal to meet the demands of these days, but a re-hash of the rather dreary sins which men and women have committed since Adam and Eve came to grief in the Garden of Eden!

There is a price to be paid for everything in this world, as every adult who has grown up physically and emotionally fully realises. And if there is another world ahead, it seems that there is a high admission price for that! We must pay the highest price for the best quality. Successful marriage involves paying a price which is never fully met. It has to be paid for all the time. Love makes its demands daily, and continues making them. But it yields dividends all the time, too.

Society imposes certain restrictions upon our sexual expression. These restrictions were not drawn up at a conference of kill-joys or Puritans. They have arisen from centuries of experience, and are imposed in the interests of the community. No doubt there have been times when the state has tended to over-step the mark; occasionally it has exceeded its rightful functions in this, as in other spheres.

It has helped to instil within us a morbid sense of guilt and fear regarding sex relationships. It has shrouded sex with an unwholesome air of mystery; it has, indeed, made sex almost a banned subject so far as public discussion is concerned. Thus the abysmal ignorance among our people regarding what is, unquestionably, one of the most important concerns of every human being,

is largely the fault of society. Even so, we must face the fact that practical and realistic considerations have made certain restrictions necessary.

Civilisation as a whole gives its blessing to full sexual expression for those who are married. Some people doubt that it is wise to impose any restrictions on the expression of a basic, natural impulse. They argue that if sexual expression is natural and right, there should be no arbitrary rules and regulations to interfere with it. If love is good, they say, then why make it free?

Here is the old, old struggle between those who believe in ordered progress and those who believe in anarchy. It is "Do what is best" against "Do what you like." And by "best" in marriage we must mean what is best for both parties, and for any children who may result from the union.

It is, perhaps, inevitable that those who find it hard to conform to rules and regulations in general, find it particularly hard to do so in the field of sexual expression. Those who speak disparagingly of family ties and responsibilities often are determined to live their lives contrary to society's laws and conventions. They may have the courage of their convictions. But they are dangerous.

Marriage as an institution exists because human beings throughout the centuries have found it necessary. Those who seek, not to improve it, but to destroy it, are not beneficent revolutionaries (as they often imagine) but reactionaries who would create conditions good for neither men nor women.

I have had various discussions with youth groups on sex problems. Time after time I have been astonished at the way some of these young people seem to suppose that what is often termed loose living is something refreshingly new, brave, daring, part of the outlook which will bring in the new and better world. Some even talk of a new way of life, for all the world as though sexual adventures outside the realm of marriage represented something unprecedented in human experience. They look quite disappointed when I point out that there have been adulterers since the year dot. Some modern adventurers in this sphere seem to have found a new meaning to the old expression, "original sin." Running foul of convention in any shape or form seems to them entirely novel and admirable.

The extreme rebels against convention in the realm of sex have not made much progress throughout the ages. And those who demand "free love" to-day are working with precisely the same technique as that of the early rebels! Of course, it all becomes rather monotonous after a time, and at middle age, if not before, all the false glamour wears off. Then the collective wisdom of society seems to have something to commend it after all.

It is easy—often fatally easy!—to "live one's own life in one's own way," as it is often put, much easier than to get right down in earnest to the task of making a success of marriage. But in the overwhelming majority of cases the first way leads to nothing but disillusionment. The other way, playing according to the rules, and striving to live one's life as a member of a community instead of solely for one's own, little self, is the big way, the one which yields the lasting benefits, including some of the deepest satisfactions men and women experience.

Nowadays, while comparatively few people are prepared to argue in favour of out-and-out freedom in sexual life, a larger number advocate trial marriage, which incidentally, can easily become much the same thing. Trial marriage means the coming together of two persons for a certain period as an

experiment—to ascertain whether or not they are suited to each other. Marriage is the ultimate goal. If things go well and the couple are agreed that they desire to live together permanently, then eventually they marry. If not, they part.

That is the theory of trial marriage. As far as I am aware, there are no statistics available to show what proportion of trials result in marriage. I would hazard the guess, however, that a very large number do not result in marriage. Undoubtedly, many are merely excuses for sexual relations with no intention on the part of those concerned, or of one of them, to marry.

Obviously the period of experiment must vary according to the nature and temperament of the parties. How long it would take any particular couple to discover whether they were suited to each other, it is quite impossible to say. The advocates of trial marriage appear to vary the period according to their individual inclinations. This may be convenient for them as individuals. It makes it very difficult, however, for the commentator to nail down precisely what period a trial marriage should cover. Whether the period should be long or short, and at what stage a trial marriage should be regarded as qualified to be accounted a full marriage, nobody seems to know. All of which renders it easy for those who participate in almost any kind of irregular union to announce that theirs is a trial marriage!

Perhaps the best way to consider the whole question of trial marriage as it affects the individual is to adopt a severely practical attitude, and to try to visualise a trial marriage, not in some out-of-the-way place where only the two co-experimenters exist, but against the background of society as it exists to-day. Unless we do this, the proposal has no relation to present-day realities.

Right from the start, whether they desired it or not, the couple determined to "try" marriage would have to live in conflict with society, to some extent at least, and probably to a very considerable extent. That would be a bad start. We are all members one of another, we all need the approval of our fellows. We can attain our highest good only as members of the wider community. Yes, it would be a bad start. But it would be only the start. There would be worse to come.

In addition to having to live in conflict with those around them, the partners in the trial marriage would have individual difficulties which, however carefully they might conceal them, would be very real. Apart from being cut off from the community of which they formed a part, each of the parties would be in conflict with his or her inner self. Even if the world without was not unduly disturbed, and regarded the whole thing with amused tolerance, the parties to the unorthodox temporary union would be certain to suffer as a result of the inner conflicts.

For a time the couple might find it easy to make light of the neighbours' hostility or amusement; but inevitably they would begin to suffer from being cut off from the community. The feeling that one "does not belong" is bad for anybody. Those who choose to live in conflict with society are bound to experience it.

Moreover, as time passed there would be tinges of self-reproach. No matter how strongly the couple might feel at the outset that "we have a right to live our own lives in our own way," conscience would increasingly make itself felt. A bad conscience is always a bad partner to live with!

Thus those who experiment in this manner are at a disadvantage from the start. I am well aware that the more advanced advocates of experimental marriage listen with great impatience to these arguments. But it is a fact that often they are young people who have had little experience of the real problems of life, and who have not had the advantage of meeting men and women of all types and ages who have experimented outside of marriage or who in other ways have disregarded society's code of conduct. It has been my experience, and I know that others share this view, that very few of those who defy society, especially in matters of sex and marriage, fail to regret it in the long run.

Trial marriage does, of course, appeal to people who feel that they must be different from others—the "whole-hoggers," the extremists, the revolutionaries. They lack adjustment to life and are incapable of rising to the demands which the community makes upon us all. Those who are attracted to trial marriage are almost certain to fail in marriage itself because their whole outlook is wrong.

They demand certainty where there can be no absolute certainty. That is the basic failing. But, curiously enough, although they regard conventional marriage as too risky to be attempted, they rush to embrace what undoubtedly is a much bigger gamble than marriage. It is positively pathetic to observe the manner in which such people begin by passing a vote of no confidence in themselves and in marriage. They realise that marriage involves the acceptance of responsibility and that is what they dread. They realise that marriage does involve certain risks; these they grossly magnify, and also dread. Yet we must face the fact that most ventures in life are worth while only if they are tackled in deadly earnest. This is true of marriage, as I have sought to show. Those who lack the confidence in themselves to accept marriage with all its risks, its challenge, its responsibilities, and its opportunities are unlikely to gain anything from a period of trial marriage.

Then again, we must assume that some trial marriages will fail: Where this is so—and I should expect failure to be the result of the majority of trial marriages—the feeling of inadequacy which led the parties to experiment at the start in order to make sure, will be increased. Just as "nothing succeeds like success," so nothing depresses like failure. It creates the expectation of further failures. And if one trial does prove a failure, what then? Are the individuals concerned to go on "trying" elsewhere with other partners? If so, then trial marriage is simply a sort of playground for the emotionally unstable.

Those who advocate trial marriage because they fear failure in marriage are, of course, really afraid of themselves. That is what it amounts to. The cynics have said that "marriage is a fight to the finish." It is—though not, at best, in precisely the way they mean. It is worth fighting hard in order to achieve married happiness. Those who embrace trial marriage fear that struggle, believing vainly that they can collect without any effort, the happiness which a successful love-relationship brings. They are love-speculators who hope to gain the benefit of all the rises in the curve of happiness, and at the same time be free to "sell out" so soon as there are signs of a fall.

Can happiness in marriage be thus acquired, on "the cheap"? All experience proves conclusively it cannot be enjoyed by those who are unwilling to pay the price.

CHAPTER X

COMPANIONATE MARRIAGE

"YOUTH has already been on the war-path for some time" wrote Judge Ben Lindsey in his sensational (in more senses than one) book entitled *The Companionate Marriage*. Youth has always been on the war-path and always will be—until it ceases to be youth. The trouble is that middle-aged and elderly spokesmen of youth have a habit of telling us exactly what youth wants, with a confidence which is exceedingly impressive until we seek first-hand information from the young people themselves. Then, very often, we find that it is only a minority of young people who share the views of their self-appointed, more experienced leaders.

The "companionate marriage," of which so much has been heard in recent years, has been presented in a very attractive manner. It has won thousands of devotees on both sides of the Atlantic, a large proportion of whom have only the vaguest idea of what it is that Judge Lindsey and his Good Companions desired to achieve. All marriage is "companionate," if that term has any meaning at all. Yet to be a "Companionate," as Judge Lindsey used the term, is to be an experimenter in trial marriage.

I have found that many people hotly dispute my contention that companionate marriage is simply trial marriage under another name, and with one or two exceptionally undesirable features added to it. Judge Lindsey told us that, to crowd a programme as big as the companionate marriage into the space usually devoted to a dictionary definition is a mental exercise which he warmly recommended to cross-word puzzle fans. But he has attempted his own definition. Here it is:

"The companionate marriage is a programme which proposes to legalise, stabilise, and direct certain of the customs, privileges, and practices of modern marriage; practices which are already in widespread use, but which have no legal status or direction."

That is his definition for what it is worth—and I do not think it is worth much. Although he expressly described it as an "extended and explicit version," I think the average reader will find it extremely vague. It does not really say what companionate marriage is. All that we can gather from it is that Judge Lindsey was one of those reformers who want to direct certain marriage privileges and practices, though which, he does not reveal. There are practices which are already in widespread use, but which have no legal status or direction. But there are many practices which are customary in marriage and which have no legal status or direction, yet have nothing whatever to do with companionate marriage.

Actually, as one discovers by reading his book on the subject, the Judge's definition bears little relationship to his proposals. He wanted "birth control" to be made legal in America, together with a system of "divorce by mutual consent for persons who have no children, such divorce to be granted only after a court of domestic relations had failed in a humane and scientific effort

to reconcile the couple." Certain provisions for alimony and support were "to be allowed when, in the judgment of the court, circumstances justify it."

Many of those who advocate companionate marriage in this country appear to be under the impression that Judge Lindsey's proposals were designed to ensure more freedom than our present laws and conventions permit. The fact that childless couples were promised "divorce by mutual consent" has been stressed time and time again. What is less well known, in Great Britain at any rate, is that in spite of this mutual consent, the couple must face what the Judge calls "A House of Human Welfare," consisting of various experts, whose task it is specifically to endeavour "in a humane and scientific manner" to reconcile the couple.

The "free love" advocates who feel that they had a supporter in Judge Lindsey undoubtedly are mistaken. His form of trial marriage is one hedged about by infinitely more restrictions than most people in any democratic country would be prepared to submit to in a matter so essentially personal as marriage. From the standpoint of freedom it certainly must be regarded as a step backward.

Apparently the married companions of the companionate marriage who feel that, if things go wrong, they have a good "get-away" in the mutual consent provision, would be expected to satisfy the "House of Human Welfare" that they were people who really knew their own minds. For, Judge Lindsey said, "When I speak of mutual consent I do not mean divorce given informally and easily, for the mere asking, but, rather, divorce given after due inquiry has demonstrated that the couple *really want it and don't just think they want it.*"

In other words, the couple are not to be given credit for knowing whether they want a divorce or not! And who are the experts who comprise the grandiloquently-styled "House of Human Welfare"? A judge would preside over it, and with him would sit "scientific experts and specialists in human conduct and behaviour." These would be entrusted with the task of deciding whether two people who could not make up their minds as to whether they were likely to make a success of marriage or not, and who accordingly experimented as marital "companions," really knew what they wanted when, sooner or later, they mutually decided to request a divorce.

On the whole, it would appear that the odds would be heavily weighed against the couple. For since they had embarked upon their "companionate marriage" in an uncertain frame of mind, choosing such a preliminary test simply because they were dubious as to their chances of attaining reasonable happiness in normal marriage, any body of intelligent men and women, let alone "experts in human behaviour," might be pardoned for assuming that six months later one or both the parties might be desirous of changing their present decision.

Then again, mutual consent involves a similar decision by *both parties*. What proportion of temporary unions of those intended to be permanent, for that matter, break up by the genuine, freely-decided, *mutual* consent of the partners? Not a very high one, I should say. Usually one partner is much more eager to secure freedom from the ties than the other. What then?

Judge Lindsey thought of that point. "Mutual consent" would be a misnomer, he said, where one party wished the divorce and the other did not. And he added: "No rule can be laid down for such unfortunate situations."

But in either case, whether the divorce is requested by the mutual consent of the parties, or by only one of them, it comes to the same thing: The court, disguised as a "House of Human Welfare," can decide for or against.

It is worth turning back for a moment at this stage to Judge Lindsey's definition of his proposal. For after this brief examination of his scheme we can appreciate more adequately his statement that companionate marriage seeks "to *legalise, stabilise, and direct* certain of the customs, privileges, and practices of modern marriage; practices which are already in widespread use, but which have no legal status or direction." His programme, according to his own definition, sounds very much like the kind of Order issued by Government departments in Great Britain in time of war, and by gauleiters in totalitarian countries both in peace and war. It presupposes that direction from *without* can help to cure marital ills; that stability can be attained by making legally binding marriages which both partners seek to terminate on no more solid grounds than that the parties have failed to prove that they know their own minds!

The companionate marriage as advocated by Judge Lindsey is hardly worth serious consideration. The secret court charged with the task of prying into the couple's affairs, behind closed doors, and not answerable to public opinion for its decisions, would surely be intolerable in any democracy.

The proposed companionate marriage accepts unwillingness on the part of the parties to assume adult responsibilities; all that it does is to transfer the responsibility from the only shoulders which should bear it, to a court of law which functions behind closed doors. Starting with the assumption that for many people, if not for most, marriage is too grave a responsibility, it entrusts to the state, through "Houses of Human Welfare," the task of directing what form the marriage should take, and whether it should continue or be terminated.

Instead of the proposal being, as some young people who are unfamiliar with Judge Lindsey's real proposals believe, a magnificent opportunity for youth to display its daring by opening up fresh ground, it is nothing more or less than a specious plan for the growth of bureaucratic interference in a sphere where it is most out of place—that of marriage and sex relations, the most intimate of all human activities.

I have often wondered why such a reactionary doctrine as that expounded and advocated by Judge Ben Lindsey should have been embraced by many whose purpose in general is to widen the bounds of freedom. Possibly the manner in which the companionate marriage has been advocated has had something to do with this! In an introduction to *The Companionate Marriage* the Hon. Mrs. Bertrand Russell wrote "It may be hoped that both in England and America, Judge Lindsey's book will *assist the rebels to establish their case* against the older morality upon a firmer and more documented foundation."

The book has headings to each page as well as to each chapter, and they give to the whole a sensational appearance which might well cause the mere scanner to assume that here, indeed, was the apostle of Flaming Youth. Here are some of the headings: *Helga Gets Into Trouble; Sex and Gold; I Want All of You; Bathing Naked in Japan; When Murder is Respectable; Erotic Avarice; A French Episode; A Husband in a Hurry; What is a Sweetie? Concerning Millie's Legs; Being Wicked Legally; Hattie the Home Breaker; The Girl with a Gilded Head; I Wanted a Woman; Smoke-Screens and Feather Beds.*

Doubtless it would be possible for some outstanding genius to present, under such headlines, a philosophy or a set of practical proposals designed to revolutionise marriage and to show humanity where it has been wrong for so many centuries. But one cannot help feeling that the method of presentation was a hindrance rather than a help to any writer with serious aims. As it is, many of the "rebels" who stoutly plump for Judge Ben Lindsey appear to have read only the headlines, and to be completely unfamiliar with the specific proposals which the Judge made.

The attractively-styled "House of Human Welfare" may well prove to be the gateway to something approaching legalised misery for many people. But, like the "Strength Through Joy" crusade in Hitler-ridden Germany, its very name may help to deceive many as to its true purpose and nature.

Such development of state-control in the love-relationship—for that is what it amounts to—would result from a faulty diagnosis. Marriages fail because people fail. No marriage is stronger, or weaker, than its partners. Individual responsibility is absolutely vital to healthy marriage. But this companionate substitute for the genuine article weakens the sense of individual responsibility in marriage by transferring responsibility to the state.

There is a further serious objection to companionate marriage. Judge Lindsey maintained that he was advocating only what was, in effect, already a widely accepted practice, since young people often do decide to live together as man and wife without having any children. He would legalise this relationship, but if children should result from the union, then marriage must follow. Clearly, young people attracted to experiment in this legally-sanctioned form of trial marriage would try to avoid having children, otherwise the "freedom" which is the main attraction of the companionate marriage would be forfeited. There can be no doubt that in many, possibly the majority of cases, much love-making of the kind which stops short of complete physical union would result.

Dr. Kenneth Walker has commented upon this aspect of the companionate marriage. He points out that by separating those physical intimacies which are normally the prelude to sexual communion from their natural goal, many modern young men and women make of courtship an end in itself. He adds that "this is a mischievous compromise—a compromise that may easily be productive of harm." In the United States, where "petting" is prevalent, many girls have become so accustomed to this secondary form of sex expression that, even after marriage, they desire to substitute it for normal bodily union. Various American sexologists have drawn attention to this. The companionate marriage would inevitably give impetus to this tendency, one which is unquestionably troubling sex educationists both in America and in Great Britain. "The separation of courtship and the making of the intimacies that should only act as a prelude an end in themselves cannot be condemned too strongly," says Dr. Kenneth Walker. "Much better, if intimacies have gone so far, that they should be normally completed."

The companionate marriage appeals to many because it appears to offer a large measure of freedom from responsibility. The free marriage, on the other hand, emphasises above all the responsibility of the individual in marriage. The success of a marriage depends upon the quality of those who embark upon it. Freedom within, emancipation from emotional immaturity, and from the

fears and doubts which arise from within themselves, will enable truly free men and women to manage their marriages without resort to control centres, courts, or other directing agencies. Free marriage is for free people. Companionate marriage is limited liability marriage with the Official Receiver always just across the road!

CHAPTER XI

MOTHER RUSSIA AND HER FAMILY

"*What about Russia?*" That is the question.

I am often asked this question by those who seem to suppose that Russia long ago solved all the problems connected with marriage, and particularly with relations outside of marriage, along the lines of "sexual freedom."

It is not only the younger people, especially the "rebels" as they proudly and not inaptly style themselves, who ask the question. These young people often desire to see sweeping changes in our laws and customs. Others, more conservative, and usually older—the "die hards" of marriage who believe that any changes must be for the worse—also ask it. But their object in raising the question is to point to what they believe is an awful example of how a loosening of marriage ties works out in practice.

Well, *what* about Russia?

In the past it has not always been easy to obtain the facts about life in that great country. Highly-coloured accounts of life there have usually been based upon imagination inspired either by liking for, or dislike of, the regime. But now we know enough to reveal beyond doubt that in Russia, as in other countries, the lessons of experience have demonstrated that dire dangers lurk behind the idea of free and easy divorce, and the stability of marriage is a vital factor in the life of the state, as in that of the individual.

Russia has, of course, experimented in this sphere. Advocates of "companionate marriage" and of "free and easy divorce" have pointed to Russia as the shining example of how "sexual freedom" showers blessings upon those who are bold and enlightened enough to embrace it. Alas, they cannot do so now. A change of policy became manifest in 1936 when abortion was made illegal except for health reasons and difficulties were placed in the way of divorce. A decree published in Moscow, and dated 8th July, 1944, completes the *volte face*. Soviet policy is henceforth to be directed towards "*the strengthening of family ties*." A crushing blow has been dealt to the old idea expressed by Lenin that "it is impossible to be a democrat and a Socialist without at once demanding the full freedom of divorce."

The advocates of "free love" who used to point to Russia must be very discomforted by this decree. It was, of course, published during the war. The purpose of those who framed it was to initiate a set of measures designed to secure a massive increase in Russia's population during the years following the war. As *The Economist* commented at the time, "Taken together, these measures constitute perhaps the most radical and comprehensive programme for a population policy that any government has yet formulated. They are unique in social legislation."

These unique and far-reaching measures embody the considered plan of the Soviet authorities to *strengthen* family ties. To a degree never before attempted in any country, the full strength of the state is placed behind the family. And while this "unique" and "radical and comprehensive" social legislation is designed to protect the family and to make it secure against economic ills, another section of the decree makes a bold frontal attack upon that easy divorce which, hitherto, has been claimed by "rebels" the world over to be an impressive success.

Unregistered marriages cease to have any legal validity. The "companionate marriage," therefore, is no longer regarded in Russia as being a marriage at all—a somewhat serious set-back for the advocates of Judge Lindsey's proposals, who have quoted Russia's example in support of their own aims! Moreover, no longer is divorce to be as easy as possible in Russia. Instead, obstacles are placed deliberately in the path of those who contemplate it.

Formerly, applications for divorce were considered privately—a point which greatly pleased the advocates of Judge Lindsey's "House of Human Welfare," with their veils of secrecy. Henceforth all divorce applications in Russia are to be heard in public. Power to grant divorces has been taken away from the People's Courts. These "Houses of Human Welfare" have, it seems, failed. Only the higher courts may now grant a divorce.

Henceforth Russia will certainly not be a land of "cheap and easy divorce," for the fees to be paid in connection with divorce applications have been fixed high—well above the reach of all except the highest income-groups. It is clear from all this that the Soviet authorities, unsurpassed for their "realistic" approach to the problems affecting the state, have not found the provision of easy ways out of marriage quite the success which it has appeared to some observers in Great Britain and on the other side of the Atlantic!

Those advanced reformers who believe that Soviet policy is directed towards the attainment of a large measure of sexual freedom undoubtedly are mistaken. Russia's policy is dominated by one clearly-defined objective—that of securing a large increase in the population. Indeed to some extent individual freedom is to be sacrificed in the effort to reach this goal. The Russian parent who argues that quality is more important than quantity, and who seeks to implement this belief, is to be made to suffer. Many advantages available to those who have large families will be denied to him. A tax is imposed on small families. Every citizen of the Soviet Union is expected to play a part in the battle for increased production of people!

The state cannot compel people to breed. But it can make it worth their while to do so, and can make it very hard for those who fail to do so. Precisely how all this furthers the cause of sexual freedom, or any other kind of freedom, has not as yet been explained, so far as I am aware, by those who find everything emanating from Russia to be good! But as some of the "rebel" propagandists display extraordinary ingenuity in interpreting Russian policy for British consideration, I have no doubt that the attempt will be made. It should be very interesting.

The Russian bachelor and spinster have to pay special taxes. A family with two children may be liable to taxation. But if the family is increased to three, it does not have to pay a tax but receives a lump sum of 400 roubles on the birth of the third child. For four or more children there is both a lump sum

and a very liberal children's allowance, which is paid monthly, for a period of five years.

For the eleventh child these payments, over a five-year period, amount to 23,000 roubles. What this means in terms of living standards may be gathered from the following quotation from *The Economist* of 15th July, 1944: "The average monthly wage of workers in the lower income groups is between 400 and 600 roubles, amounting to between 24,000 and 36,000 roubles in five years. The allowances are thus very large, the more so since they are apparently cumulative—the allowance of 23,000 roubles is for the eleventh child, not for eleven children."

These extremely high family allowances are by no means the only inducements offered to encourage—almost compel, so far as that is possible!—parents to help in the effort to increase the population. There are numerous concessions designed to assist parents of large families. The fees paid to kindergartens have been halved. Rations for mothers have been increased. Pregnant women have been freed by decree from the obligation to work overtime, even during the war. They also have been forbidden to do night work. Leave from industry on confinement has been increased from nine to eleven weeks.

Special medals have also been introduced with the object of raising the status of mothers as such. The "Glory of Motherhood" medal is one. The "Order of the Heroic Mother" is another. There are others. They are not given simply as decorations; they bring with them special advantages, such as the right to better clothing and better food than other women can obtain, and the right to ignore queues, which last is regarded as a particularly valuable advantage in Russia, the country which easily holds the world's record for queues, whether in war or peace.

I have not mentioned these reforms in order to pour scorn upon them. Undoubtedly some of them are good. But not one of them is a step towards "sexual freedom." On the other hand, without surveying the Russian scene through spectacles coloured by prejudice, one might well see more than a suggestion of something which is the very opposite of freedom. The penalisation of the unmarried and the taxation of small families is coupled with extremely liberal payments to large families. Rigid anti-divorce legislation favours Russia's well-to-do and presses heavily upon the poorer members of the community. The whole decree is the direct opposite of that freedom which is held in some quarters to be Russia's distinctive contribution to modern marriage and sexual relations.

With such tremendous efforts being made to increase the birth-rate in Russia many may suppose that Russia's position as regards population must be an extremely serious one. But this does not appear to be the case. True, up-to-date figures are not available, and we must consider the terrible toll taken by war. Even so, on the latest available figures Russia's position as regards the "population problem" is an unusually good one. In a publication entitled "The Future Population of Europe and the Soviet Union" (League of Nations, Geneva) issued in 1944, it is pointed out that according to the last census in most European countries fertility was below the level required to maintain a stationary population. "In England and Wales, Norway, Switzerland and Latvia, it was ten to twenty per cent below the replacement level. In the U.S.S.R. the net reproduction rate was over 1.60, that is, one that if maintained would result in an increase of more than sixty per cent per generation."

The italics are mine. This report dealt with the period round about 1930. The war losses may have caused the Russian leaders to feel that everything must be subordinated to an intensive population policy. Russia clearly believes in the big battalions, and is determined to have them. And in her effort to attain this end, she is turning her back upon past experiments in "sexual freedom" with state encouragement and toleration.

When, in 1932, the Soviet Marriage Code was published in Great Britain, the introduction denounced such phrases as "the indissolubility of marriage" and "the sanctity of the family hearth" as being "high-sounding phrases with which the bourgeoisie hypocritically covers the rottenness and falsehood of the bourgeois system." What, precisely, do these phrases—or others very like them, which now appear in Moscow decrees—cover? Can it be the breakdown of the whole system developed by the earlier Soviet Marriage Code?

A clear and interesting account of the Russian law on marriage as it existed before 1936 is given in Alec Craig's "Sex and Revolution." He opens his chapter on Russia with these words: "For an example of a body of sexual law based on modernist ideology it is necessary to go to Russia." But that was in 1934.

The Soviet Marriage Code at that time included features which have been warmly praised by extremist reformers the world over. Divorce was granted "on the simple demand of either party." Abortion was permissible "at the simple demand of the woman."

The blind support of everything Russian is a truly amazing form of prejudice the like of which we rarely see in Great Britain, outside the ranks of certain very extreme and intolerant religious sects. How far this unthinking, slavish adherence can take its victims we saw when Russia was attacked by the Germans during the war. The very next day saw British communists, who until then had been opposed to the "Imperialist" participation of Britain in the war, became rabid supporters of the war effort! No doubt the sudden reversal of Soviet policy regarding divorce will result in a quick change-over from the advocacy of "sexual freedom on the Russian model" to support of the rigid, undemocratic, "population at any price" policy which Russia has now adopted.

It must not be assumed that Russia has decided to return to what is often called "the old morality." On severely practical grounds, and entirely as a matter of convenience, she has made up her mind to have many more children who can work for her, and, if necessary, fight for her. *How* the children are born, whether in or out of wedlock, is quite immaterial. Mother Russia wants a large family.

This is clear from the new provisions relating to what we in Britain call illegitimate children. The state now accepts responsibility for the care of all children born out of wedlock. Unmarried mothers may pass their children over to the state, which will bring them up in special children's homes, entirely at state expense. If, however, an unmarried mother wants to bring the children up herself, she is permitted to do so, and is able to draw children's benefit for the first and subsequent children (instead of waiting for the fourth) and for 12 year instead of 5 year periods.

Not only is the unmarried mother protected. Steps have been taken to protect the unmarried father. No longer may an unmarried mother sue the father of her children for maintenance. The new decree tells Russian women—

of whom there will be a large surplus in the post-war years—that the more children they have, the happier the state will be. Provided they have the children, the state will gladly meet the bills! This is the only part of the new decree which will gladden the hearts of the “rebels!”

The Russian citizen has no really free choice in the matter of parenthood. Either he has children, many children, or he pays the penalty. Compulsion is applied to the maximum degree. The new Russian Marriage Code is, therefore, the exact opposite of free marriage.

We have to plan our lives and improve our marriage laws and customs according to *our own* needs. Free marriage is for free people who are not afraid to think for themselves. It involves the minimum of state interference in what after all is the most personal and intimate sphere of human activity. There is a middle course which lies between the extreme which Russia has abandoned, and the new extreme which judges the value of a marriage entirely by its productivity in numbers. That middle path is the path of ordered progress, which seeks above all the happiness and welfare of human beings, and regards the state as the servant of the people, and not the people as the tools of the state. It is a path which free men and women may tread. *Let us keep to it!*

CHAPTER XII

THE CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCHES

THE whole idea that a man is ever justified in seeking physical relief at the risk of his wife's life or his children's welfare strikes me as being fundamentally un-Christian. Yet it is definitely taught by many Christians.

CLAUD MULLINS.

This statement occurs in the excellent book *Marriage, Children and God*, by the very human magistrate of the South Western Police Court, London. The book throws a flood of much-needed light upon the appalling crimes against women and children which are committed by men who not only regard themselves as Christians, but who glory in the self-righteous belief that they are instruments of the Divine Will in perpetrating the most horrible offences.

Mr. Mullins quotes an astonishing passage from a book entitled *The Christian and Birth Control*, which was published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, a fact which in itself gave the book a certain measure of “standing.” Moreover, the author was a man of considerable influence in the English Church, none other than the late Headmaster of Eton, Canon Edward Lyttelton, D.D.

Canon Lyttelton sets up in opposition to “Birth Control” an ideal of “the heroism of self-control,” and he gives a clearly-written account of the sexual exploits of one of these “heroes” whose bravery forbids them to use contraceptive technique, but who evidently place a woman's life at a lower level of value than a few minutes of physical enjoyment gained solely at the woman's expense.

This particular "hero" had a wife who is described as having been in her prime, and who had two children. A physician warned the wife that if she had another child she would probably lose her life. On the other hand, the husband suffered from an infirmity "which undeniably made continence injurious to health." (One would like to be informed what this infirmity was. Many a doctor would deny that such an infirmity existed!)

The husband sought advice, and was told: "Very well, then, you now have the indication that for you further abstinence would be wrong. Your duty, then, is to recognise *the Holy Spirit's hint* and act upon it. Come together again and leave the issue in God's hands . . . no harm ever comes of doing right."

The wife was "more than willing to run the risk," both partners were "deeply religious people," and they were "convinced that they were acting in obedience to the Divine dictation." So they indulged in the sexual act by means of a union in which, we are told, "there was no element of mere physical indulgence"—a sheer impossibility, of course!

Still, we are assured by the writer that this union, which contained "no element of physical indulgence," resulted in the woman becoming pregnant. She died in childbirth.

Now you, presumably an ordinary, normal human being, are probably feeling sympathy for the unfortunate wife. But if you are you are missing the real heights to which the story should be lifting you. Instead of thinking about the wife, you should be gasping with admiration at the "splendid self-conquest" of the husband! Believe it or not, the account of this thoroughly sordid coitus and its tragic result is followed by this comment:

"*The way he bore it was a signal instance of the power of the true Christian.* . . . I have never seen so fine a triumph of faith in any ordinary man of the world. Of course, it was misunderstood. He told me he had never, before his loss, felt so near to Christ."

The italics throughout are, of course, mine. Mr. Claud Mullins, after quoting in rather fuller detail than I have done, asks: "Is not this blasphemy?" Dean Inge, after repeating this revolting story, said that the husband's conduct was "unspeakable." In *Christian Ethics and Modern Problems* he remarked that he knew of a clergyman "who caused the death of his wife in precisely the same way."

Like Canon Lyttelton, "I have never seen so fine a triumph of faith in any ordinary man of the world" when conduct even remotely resembling that of this "hero" has been in question; indeed, I have found that ordinary men who put their own selfish interests before those of their wives or children invariably are thoroughly ashamed of themselves. Only the most pernicious teaching, in which the individual concerned has been thoroughly grounded, could possibly lower any "ordinary man" to such a level that he could not only act thus, but could even delude himself into believing that his action brought him "so near to Christ."

Of course, not all—indeed, not many—Christians would be capable of acting in so selfish and cruel a manner as did this "hero" of Canon Lyttelton's. But we have to face the unpleasant fact that there are people actively advocating these appalling doctrines, and, by cloaking them in a veneer of Christianity of a sort, making them acceptable to the unthinking.

For my part, I have no hesitation in saying that the husband in the case described above, morally, at any rate, committed murder. Knowing quite well the danger to his wife, he insisted. If the reference to "the Holy Spirit's hint" is not blasphemy, I do not know what is!

It will be noted that there is no word of sympathy for the wife; the husband is the "hero," and the wife's death appears to be a very minor matter. Mr. Mullins comments: "That the wife consented to take the risk seems a specially bad feature, for she obviously did so under extreme moral pressure." It was, in fact, her "duty" to be sacrificed if need be, because her husband had received a "hint" from the Holy Spirit!

Unfortunately, these doctrines which instigate the sacrifice of the lives of women and children are supported by certain bodies which claim to speak for what they term "purity." Their promoters are obsessed with the physical side of sex to such an extent that they see in sexual hunger an indication of God's will, and maintain, therefore, that abstinence is wrong. One could explain it all very simply by saying that these people are very much the victims of physical sexuality and that as part of their defence mechanism they use "The Holy Spirit" and claim to feel God's guidance urging them on.

It is not my purpose to seek to state the arguments against such views as those I have quoted; they, and their admitted results, stand self-condemned. Arguments are not necessary to refute standards which are so low that they are repugnant to nine people out of ten. Rather it is my purpose to point out what a serious obstacle to religious progress is provided by organisations which propagate, from within the shelter of the Church, and upon its approved printing presses, ideas and "ideals" which are infinitely lower than those of the most materialistically-minded members of the community.

Passages from unfortunate outbursts by parsons, and quotations from pamphlets and books which have been issued in the interests of "purity" often shock serious-minded young men and women, and, of course, it is these more extreme and sensational statements which inevitably attract attention in the press and elsewhere.

Time after time I have been asked: "Why does the Church advocate *this*?" And "this" has been some ill-advised outburst quoted in the press. The only possible answer is to say that I cannot speak for the Church, but that to my knowledge many enlightened modern Christian writers adopt a sane and Christ-like attitude to sex. I would suggest to members of the Churches, all the Churches, that it is high time that they took this matter in hand. As it is, doctrines which represent a "morality" on an animalistic level are far too common. Instead of protesting against the "paganism"—more imaginary than real—of the "New Psychology," which is blamed for so many modern ills, from decreased church attendance to sexual laxity, our church leaders would do well to embark earnestly upon a crusade *within* the Church designed to achieve some measure of agreement upon a sexual morality which can be seen by the average man to bear at least some discoverable relationship to the spirit and teachings of Christ.

In this book I have urged tolerance, and the spirit of tolerance for which I have pleaded urges me to mention one or two points which are of interest in view of the foregoing. First, when Mr. Mullins published his book it was warmly commended in a foreword which the Right Rev. R. G. Parsons, then Lord Bishop of Southwark, contributed. Second, the religious press was

exceedingly warm in its welcome of the book. The *St. Paul's Review*, London Diocesan Quarterly, said: "We go so far as to *beg* for its careful study." The *Guardian* wrote: "This is a book which every clergyman ought to read and study."

No doubt the Churches are suffering a good deal from the poor advertisement they receive from some of their more misguided propagandists. As it is, the young people of to-day, and many of the not-so-young, look upon the Church as the defender of doctrines of sexual morality which are too low to be worthy of serious consideration. This is one factor which has contributed to the rise of the so-called "New Morality." It is safe to say that, had the Churches been loyal to a system of morality closely based upon the words and spirit of Christ, and not upon the outpourings of theologians who, from St. Paul onwards, have "watered-down" or explained away much of Christ's essential message, we should not have been faced with the challenge of the "New Morality" to-day. Doubtless free love would have had its supporters and practitioners; but they would hardly have advocated their ideas in the guise of a "New Morality."

There are a number of moral standards by which men and women test their own actions or judge those of others. The standards which exist in different social classes are not similar. Casual labourers were at one time regarded as the worst section of the community so far as sex morals were concerned, according to the Report of the Royal Commission on Venereal Disease, while next in the scale came "the middle and upper classes." In the badly overcrowded areas moral standards are usually low, but among the artisan class as a whole there is less departure from accepted moral standards than in any other class.

Reference is sometimes made to a "middle class morality." It is probably true that the wealthy industrialist section differs considerably, in its moral outlook, from the remaining survivors of the landed gentry, whose association with the countryside is close. No doubt the truth is that every individual has a different standard of moral values, if we take into account precise shades of emphasis and significance. Even so, there are group as well as individual standards.

For all practical purposes, however, there are three moral standards in existence to-day—the legal, the Christian, and that of society as a whole. The first has the force of law behind it. The second should represent (but does not) the moral values accepted by all Christians. The third is the social moral standard, by which is meant the *working* standard of society—not a set of fixed rules nor an unchanging code, but the general attitude of men and women as a whole. This attitude changes from time to time. To-day, the moral standard of society is often described as being lax, and by this is meant that the strict insistence upon certain rules which were formerly regarded as of the utmost importance has given way to an attitude which is much less rigid. The judgment of society against those who transgress is much less severe than it was fifty years ago. There is not nearly so strong an insistence upon stern social penalties.

In so far as this tendency towards less harshness of judgment and less severity of punishment is due to the growth of genuine tolerance, there is undoubtedly something to be said for this new outlook. But tolerance reveals itself in many spheres, not only in that of sex morals. He would indeed be

bold who would proclaim that this was a great age of toleration, when on all hands there are numerous signs of unwillingness to grant to others rights or conditions which we demand for ourselves. It would seem that a more accurate explanation of society's present "lax" attitude is the less pleasant one of indifference.

There is, of course, a sense in which it is true that sexual conduct is primarily an individual matter. But there is an undue emphasis upon this individualistic aspect. Rather surprisingly, those who are most insistent that the individual's activities in spheres other than sex must be considered against the background of the wider community, are often strong in their claims that what men and women do in their sexual relationships is entirely their own concern.

That is not true. The responsibility is primarily theirs. But it is not *solely* theirs. Individuals may appear to suffer the full consequences of foolish or unsocial acts, and it is perhaps natural that those who incline to the championship of the weak against the strong feel instinctively drawn to the defence of the individual against society. The one so weak, and standing alone with a whole world arrayed against him, invites support. But however worthy the motives which produce support for the transgressor against society's laws, the fact remains that man is essentially a social creature; almost everything he does influences, in some degree, the life around him. The merit or demerit of every action of the individual can only be properly assessed in inter-action with others of his kind.

This has always been recognised. Indeed, no primitive society has been discovered which had not some rules and regulations which interfered with the free, unrestricted working of the sex instinct. It is true that in earlier times there were not the numerous restrictive barriers which now exist, for these have increased as society has become more highly involved. Fresh knowledge brings development which makes the old rules obsolete and, possibly, a hindrance to sound progress. Sometimes these restrictive influences remain long after their purpose has been served. What is called the "cultural lag" accounts for this.

The fact that man has (whether consciously or not) acted from the earliest times upon the assumption that sex behaviour is a social matter, is not remarkable when we remember that the very continuance of human society depends upon how men and women express their sex instinct. Clearly, if the very existence of society, in the last resort, depends upon the sexual conduct of individuals, then individual sexual conduct must be of profound social significance.

These are days of social awareness. The sense of social responsibility is growing stronger. The work which an individual performs, the way he spends his leisure time, how he spends his income and savings, are all matters of social concern. Yet there is a lack of recognition that the good life, whether considered from the standpoint of the highest welfare of the individual or that of the community, demands that personal responsibility and community-welfare should be brought together, and move hand in hand, where the expression of the sex instinct is involved. This does not mean regimentation or orders from above. It means a heightened sense of individual responsibility—a widening of the social conscience to include sex.

Psychologists, doctors, teachers, youth club leaders, magistrates, probation officers, and indeed all who are concerned with the handling of "human" problems, are increasingly and acutely aware of the great need to strengthen the moral conscience. The efforts which are being made to grapple with ignorance in sex matters can only be partly successful if they are not accompanied by an awakening of moral purpose. It is desirable that people should know the facts about sex, for knowledge is better than ignorance. But it is equally desirable that they should be able to use their increased knowledge in the carrying out of a moral purpose. Indeed, if such a purpose is entirely lacking, then much of the value of the educational effort is certain to be lost.

It is my firm belief, based on experience, that the secular movement towards a higher morality to give point and purpose to sex education, and the Christian movement towards a loftier conception of sex, must regard each other as allies.

Each needs the other. The success of one is dependent upon the progress of the other. There is, to-day, a stronger feeling of mutual need in these two important sections of opinion and activity, than there has ever been; and it is growing. This fact holds rich promise for the future. But while we find this reassuring, it is as well to bear in mind that there are various difficulties which stand in the way of closer co-operation.

For example, I recently read the report of an address which was delivered to a Church of England conference by a lady who plays an important part in the Church's work among girls. She emphasised the importance of sex education, but urged that if such educational work was not made part of the full Christian teaching, it could only be regarded as worthless. That attitude is by no means uncommon among Christians, and it is therefore worth devoting a little space to a consideration of the point of view expressed.

If we are to regard sex as a natural function, we must surely agree that it is desirable to instruct children in the proper employment of that function, no matter what kind of educational establishment they may attend, and irrespective of whether they are being instructed in the Christian religion or not. Eating also is a natural function. It would seem absurd to argue that we should instruct children in the care of their teeth, the need for adequate mastication of food, and so on, only as part of a definite religious training.

A great many Christians agree with this. We may reasonably expect that before long, as sex education becomes more general, the fact that sex is a purely natural function will secure full acceptance and its implications be acted upon. But those who labour primarily in the secular field must keep in mind that the Churches hold to the position that natural functions, and indeed all that we have and do, can be transmuted into something higher and nobler through the influence of religion. Small wonder, then, that they place the main emphasis upon the transforming spiritual aspect, while those engaged in secular sex education think primarily of the immediate task of sex education *in itself*.

The two views, or rather degrees of emphasis, require to be bridged. They are being bridged as Christians become increasingly aware of the implications of a truly Christian attitude to sex, and as secular sex educationists feel the need for a moral purpose to canalise their efforts. The Church has stressed the spiritual nature of man, but has sometimes seemed to overlook the fact that he also has a body. The secular movement has seen the physical and emotional

ills which ignorance has yielded, and has sought to remedy them by education. But since the influence of the Church has diminished, and the sense of moral responsibility has become weak, the task of the secular educator has been made more difficult. "Where does it all lead?" is the question that is constantly being asked. It is asked by people of all ages, but it is heard most from the lips of the young. "What is the ideal at which we should aim?" The answer which the secular educator finds himself compelled to give to such questions may not be exactly the Christian's answer. It usually differs in terminology. But it is very near indeed to the reply which the modern Christian makes. The best books by progressive Christian thinkers reveal a striking similarity of approach and conclusion to those from enlightened secular sources.

Dr. Johnson once said: "People need to be reminded more often that they need to be instructed." The supreme task which faces those who would guide youth, or for that matter, people of any age, to a sound and purposeful mode of living, is not to create new moralities, a task best left to cranks and busybodies, but to lead people back to certain simple principles which have stood the test of the centuries. The cry is often heard: "We must create a new set of values." Sometimes those who use this expression mean that we need to translate into modern, easily-understood terms the values which should serve as our guides to conduct. Sometimes they mean that we need to apply old values to new problems which have arisen. But if they mean what they say, and really believe that they can create new values, they are mistaken. The values are there. They do not change, though our understanding of them and the use we make of them may change from time to time.

When we speak of a world of changing values we really mean that people are tending to put a higher valuation upon some things than they did formerly, and are attaching less value to certain other things. A man's valuation of things may change frequently. It is, indeed, changing constantly as the result of experience, especially as regards the minor matters which affect us all. But there may be a change in some important respect—possibly a startling change.

For example, a man whose whole life has been devoted to personal advancement and money-making may suddenly see things in an entirely new light. He might begin to put men before money, and God before gold. He might seek opportunities to serve others, where formerly he sought for opportunities to make others serve his interests. When such things occur, it is clear that the individual concerned has undergone some experience or other which has been profound. Its effects reveal its depth and importance to the person concerned.

To him, as the result of a profound experience which some rightly describe as psychological, and others equally rightly describe as religious, has come "a new way of life." His valuation of men and things is totally changed. But it is only *his* valuation which has changed. Long before he felt the urge to recognise the truth, mankind was of greater value than money, and the community, people as a whole, more important than any one individual. His valuation changed, but the real values did not.

The Christian points to moral principles as vital since they carry divine endorsement. To him, therefore, they are divine laws. The enlightened educator, who has gone as far as sex instruction alone will carry him in the service of others, discovers that he, too, must point to moral principles. Sex education leads inevitably to sex guidance. And how shall we point the way forward, unaided by the signposts of moral principles?

Thus we find that the paths followed by the secular educator and the Christian advocate tend to converge. Yet close co-operation between parson and psychologist is difficult, much more difficult than between parson and school teacher, for instance. For my part, I believe that the obstacles to closer co-operation between ministers of religion and practising psychologists will diminish as humanity's dire need becomes increasingly the genuine concern of both. As it is, there seems at times to be something almost approaching professional jealousy between two bodies of earnest people who are often brought face to face with the same enemies, although they may choose to call them by different names.

There can be little doubt that the coming of psycho-analysis was a shock to many clergymen. Stated very broadly, psycho-analysis is a technique for putting the human machine right. So, too, is Christianity. A superficial view might well result in the belief that the two must be competitors. To make matters worse, Freud, whose discovery of psycho-analysis and the development of its technique places him in humanity's debt for all time, indulged in philosophical speculations which were very definitely antagonistic to Christianity. It is as absurd to assume that psycho-analysis is anti-Christian because its discoverer and leading advocate looked askance at Christianity than it would have been to describe the Church of England as anti-Conservative or anti-Liberal when the late Dr. Temple, a paying member of the Labour Party, was enthroned as Archbishop of Canterbury.

The important point is that psycho-analysis is a new weapon with which to fight certain ailments. It is a very valuable weapon. Wisely used by Christian men it could serve a Christian purpose. Used by the inexpert or those not actuated by high ideals, it can be dangerous; but it is the *use* to which it is put which matters—that, and the skill with which it is wielded. Drugs and knives both serve a healing purpose when rightly used by competent hands, but both are dangerous in the wrong hands.

Christianity and psycho-analysis are not two different techniques for doing the same thing. Here I may perhaps quote the words of a Christian advocate, Mr. C. S. Lewis, in one of his broadcast addresses. "When a man makes a moral choice, two things are involved. One is the act of choosing. The other, the various feelings, impulses and so on which his psychological outfit presents him with, and which are the *raw material* for his choice. Now this raw material may be of two kinds. Either it may be what we would call normal, the sort of feelings that are common to all men, or else it may consist of quite unnatural feelings due to things that have gone wrong in his subconscious. Thus fear of things which are really dangerous would be an example of the first kind; an irrational fear of cats or flies would be an example of the second kind. The desire of a man for a woman would be of the first kind; the perverted desire of a man for a man would be of the second. Now what psycho-analysis undertakes to do is to remove the abnormal feelings, that is, to give the man better raw material for his acts of choice. Morality is concerned with the acts of choice themselves."

Mr. Lewis proceeds to picture three men who go to war. One has the ordinary natural fear of danger that any man has. He subdues his fear by moral effort and becomes a brave man. The other two, as the result of unconscious factors, experience irrational fears which no amount of moral effort can eliminate. These two men are treated along psycho-analytic lines and thus may be restored to the position of the first man.

"It is then that the psycho-analytical problem is over and the moral problem begins. Now that they are cured, these two men might take quite different lines. 'Thank goodness I've got rid of all those doo-dahs. Now at last I can do what I've always wanted to do—my duty in the cause of freedom.' But the other might say: 'Well, I'm very glad that I now feel moderately cool under fire. But that doesn't alter the fact that I'm jolly well determined to look after Number One and let the other fellow do the dangerous job whenever I can.'"

The psycho-analyst, like the sex educator, also arrives at the stage when free moral choice is the important thing. The Church tells us that God judges men by their moral choices, not by their external actions. Modern psychology, so far from making this seem absurd—as some suppose it does—reveals plainly the supreme wisdom which lies behind this ancient teaching. For psycho-analysis shows us beyond doubt that the external actions, by which we judge our fellow human beings, are not a reliable guide to moral worth. To quote again from the broadcast already mentioned: "When a neurotic who has a pathological horror of cats forces himself to pick up a cat for some good reason, it is quite possible that in God's eyes he has shown more courage than a healthy man may have shown in winning the V.C."

Clergymen and lay church workers should always bear well in mind that if we mix psychological and religious terms we may get hopelessly confused. Doctors have found from experience how dangerous it is to mix physiological and psychological terms. Now, with more and more clergymen and lay workers reading psychological text-books, there is a tendency to fall into much the same error, sometimes with disastrous results.

For example, the parson with a little knowledge of psychology may feel that psycho-analysis provides a splendid illustration of the ill effects of sinful thoughts, even when we strive to keep them underground, and so may make use of such terms as "repressed sin" and "sin in the unconscious." Very little thought should, I think, reveal that the whole purpose of Christian teaching is to repress sin! But repression in the psychological sense has a somewhat technical meaning; it is, indeed, a term which means a psychological process, whereas sin is a theological conception. Mix the two, and unnecessary difficulties are produced.

Let us, as a matter of interest, take a brief glance at the expression: "Sin in the unconscious." Sin, to be sin at all, must involve a deliberate choice of evil. In other words, in order to sin we must make a choice on the conscious level. The various impulses and tendencies which comprise the unconscious no doubt furnish the material for all sorts of deliberate choices if they should come into the conscious mind. But they surely cannot be classified as "sin" whilst they linger in the unconscious. They may represent in part the sources from which many temptations do in fact come to us, for when we are alone we may feel an urge to do something which we regard as wrong, yet have no idea why such a temptation should spring suddenly into the conscious mind.

There is no conscious, deliberate choice about what comes into consciousness from the unconscious, and this being the case, it is absurd to speak of "sin in the unconscious." It may be that one who has committed something which he regards as a sin in the theological sense may feel so ashamed of his action that he will strive hard to obliterate the memory of it. He may succeed, although the conscious, deliberate effort to put a thing out of mind is apt to make the memory of it the more vivid and real. But even if he should

succeed in driving from the conscious mind the memory of the deed which brings feelings of guilt, and in consequence suffers mental illness, he is not suffering from sin, but from repression, a very different thing.

It is very important that we should not, possibly as the result of mixing theological and psychological terms, get into the habit of supposing that there is some connection between neurotic illness and sin. If sin resulted in neurotic illness we should be ill, for "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." But we are not all neurotics!

But if I have felt it necessary to utter a word of friendly warning to those clergymen and other church workers who take some interest in psychology to avoid certain mistakes which are very easily made, I regard it as equally desirable to draw the attention of those outside the Church to errors regarding religion and psychology into which they may fall. Just as some people think they see a connection between sin and neurotic illness, others outside the Church try to fix upon religion the responsibility for certain kinds of mental ill-health. Who has not heard the expression: "Religious mania"? How can any mania be religious?

It is as absurd to speak of a *religious* mania as it is to speak of a sinful unconscious. Here again, confusion of terms has led some people to assume that there are thousands of unhappy victims of insanity in our asylums, who would not have been in their sad plight but for the holding of a religious faith. Of course, their delusions may assume a religious form. But the man who rejoices in the belief that he is one of the apostles, or the woman who is firmly convinced that she is the Blessed Virgin Mary, are not more the victims of religious mania than are the "Napoleons" the slaves of military mania, or the "millionaires" the fruits of money mania. All are victims of mental illness. There is always the possibility of mental conflict arising in connection with any of the interests or activities of life—home, friends, money, religion, business, and so on—but it is the mental conflict which produces neurotic illness or mental breakdown.

Having completed these necessary digressions, let us return to the consideration of psycho-analysis as it affects the clergyman or keen church worker. There are numerous cases where analysis leads to the discovery of repressed material and, by enabling the patient to recognise precisely where his difficulty has arisen, secures for him *freedom*. This may appear to be an extreme statement to those who are unaccustomed to the practice of analysis; but it is simply the plain truth. As is explained elsewhere in this book, the repressions which occasion difficulty are often of an infantile character. They may produce grave difficulties in adult life. But they only have to be revealed, for any adult to see immediately that they are only bogies—dangerous bogies, it is true. They only exert their bullying influence because they arouse false feelings of fear—or, perhaps we should say, fear which is groundless. Looked at through adult eyes they lose all their painful significance. They are seen to be pigmies which, owing to repression, have been treated like giants.

Hiding them has given them a totally false significance. Boldly to bring them out into the light of day is to rob them of this exaggerated strength, which enables them to work ill. The sufferer cannot by himself deal with the various carefully-locked boxes which he has hidden away in the deepest, darkest recesses of his unconscious mind. The analyst lends him a helping hand. That is all.

But while the process of cure sometimes proceeds as smoothly as this, there are also cases where the mere reduction of an emotional situation to its elements is not in itself sufficient. If we were convinced that one room in our house was likely to collapse and crush us, we should be afraid to enter that apartment. Once we were shown it was quite safe, all would be well. But the situation would be much different if our trouble was, not a foolish fantasy about one of our rooms, but a deep-rooted fear which went right down to the foundations. In order to remove that, it might be necessary to pull down much of the house, with the result that by the time the fear was proved to be groundless, a good deal of re-building would be necessary before we could live in reasonable comfort.

The process of psychological rebuilding is a long and difficult one. Where this is necessary the psychologist may have to enlist the aid of high ideals and to turn to any sound source of genuine inspiration for his patient. Psychology shows us how to clear the mental and emotional site ready for rebuilding. But, that done, psychology has to look round for allies. The process of re-education invariably involves the introduction of a regime of service, designed to take the patient away from self and to make him a more social creature than he was before.

There is hardly need for me to press the point further, for surely it is already clear that here is the great opportunity for religion. If the Churches can reveal to mankind a way of life which by its sheer beauty can beckon men on in search of the ideal, they can enter at the very stage where psychology steps out. Psycho-analysis can eliminate the bad emotional material and restore the conditions for a free moral choice. But where help is needed of a spiritual nature, and on the conscious level, there, surely, is a task for the Church. This is recognised by some psychologists and by some clergymen. It is a two-way traffic. The psychologist, knowing his patient's need for inspiration of a deep, driving character, often advises membership of some religious organisation. The clergyman, faced with difficulties which he sees go deeper than the surface troubles with which he can often competently deal, passes his parishioner on to the psychologist for treatment.

There is one further point worth making regarding psycho-analysis from the religious standpoint. It has been said by some churchmen, in condemnation of psycho-analysis, and by others outside the Churches in opposition to the restraints imposed by moral principles, that psycho-analysis has "abolished sin." Here again we are confronted by the difficulties which arise as soon as we mix theological and psychological terms. But let a psychologist who is also a Christian, Dr. David Yellowlees, supply the answer, in words which he used when addressing a conference of the Student Christian Movement.

"Modern psychology does not by any means abolish sin. On the contrary, it shows in some ways more vividly than ever the danger and subtlety of sin. It certainly tends to alter the emphasis in regard to the nature and meaning of sin, but it does so in just the same way that Jesus did, though the Pharisees of His day and ours do not agree. That is, it regards external acts as less important than inner motives and attitudes.

"Pride, which will not face humiliating facts; hypocrisy, which puts appearance before reality; cowardice, which will not face conflict; selfishness, which seeks to remain on a childish level and will not rise to social responsibili-

ties; fear of emotion, which is the refusal of love; these are all psychological sins, scientifically recognised as signs of imperfect development. And from the religious side, are not these the very sort of sins which most of all tend to alienate us from the life of God?"

Is it not clear from this that what the theologian calls sin and what the psychologist calls "imperfect development" are sometimes, though not always, the same thing? That fact is revealing. For the Founder of Christianity explained His mission in the world in a single, striking sentence: "I have come that they might have life, and that more abundantly." To the Christian, sin is a form of death. To the psychologist, imperfect development means restricted living. Fullness of life is the end which both seek.

Every new means of helping to cure man's emotional ills must involve a challenge to the Churches, and must inevitably produce some measure of readjustment on the Churches' part. But if my contention is sound, and psychology places in our hands a valuable weapon with which to fight mental illness, and especially one which helps us to attain a sound sex attitude, then psychology is surely a valuable ally of the Church. Equally, the inspiration which religion can impart is often needed to complete the work which psychology begins. Over and above that is the undeniable fact that a faith which yields reasonable optimism, and which gives meaning and significance to life, is psychologically desirable for all, and is an absolute necessity for some. But if the Church is to meet these needs, its message must appeal by its loftiness and beauty. Man's need for religion is a constant challenge.

The challenge to the Churches comes from without and from within. It is a call to devise a system of sex ethics which shall be recognisable by all as being in accordance with the spirit and teachings of Christ. The failure of the "Old Morality" arose from its manifest unfairness, its insistence upon one moral law for the male and another for the female. It involved cruelties, as we noted earlier in this chapter. But, as modern Christian commentators are constantly pointing out, it was *not* Christian. It may for a long time have had the Church's blessing. It may have sprung from church teaching. But it bore no discoverable relationship to the heart or mind of the gentle Christ.

In the Church—using that term to embrace the various denominations as a whole—there is unquestionably a great deal of heart-searching. There are numerous signs of quickening of the spirit. There is a welcome call for help by clergymen and Christian social workers, who feel themselves in need of guidance in order that they may the more effectively aid others in sex matters. There is, indeed, within the Church, a movement which seeks to set the Church's own house in order so that, instead of the Church being challenged by the best modern thought on human relationships, it may reassume its rightful position and challenge the world.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CLERGY AS CONSULTANTS AND ADVISERS

AMONG the lesser sacraments of the Church is Confirmation; for this there are a dozen classes or so, and personal interviews. Another of the Church's lesser sacraments is Holy Orders; for this normally a university degree is required, and two or three terms at a theological college, or more; a central Church examination must then be passed and the diocesan bishop's examination. Again, there are personal interviews, quite a number of them. Another of the lesser sacraments of the Church is Holy Matrimony; the preparation for this is a ten minutes' address which the bride's mother says is five minutes too long.

T. W. PYM in "Our Personal Ministry."

Canon Pym might have added that the ten-minute address is delivered at a time when both bride and bridegroom have a great deal on their minds, and after leaving the church are often engaged in a rush of activities which makes quiet meditation upon the clergyman's address almost impossible. That so brief a preparation for Christian marriage is totally inadequate is recognised by most clergymen and by many keen laymen. There are, however, difficulties which are not always easy to overcome, especially in these days when only one person in ten in Great Britain is attached to any church, and when lay helpers are far fewer than they have been for centuries.

With more to do than formerly, and with fewer helpers, the parson is often confronted with fresh demands. He may strongly sympathise with them. But the innumerable duties of his pastoral work and the organisational details which have to be attended to make it hard, if not impossible, to squeeze in added tasks during an already overcrowded week of duties. Moreover, there is undoubtedly a great deal of earnest questioning as to whether *any* clergyman is a suitable guide and adviser to young people about to marry. Many ministers of all denominations, who would like to see more done to prepare people for marriage, doubt their own abilities in this particular field.

This is, I think, all to the good, provided that the attitude of diffidence is not carried to extremes. Personally, I have little doubt that if there had been a general effort to prepare people for marriage through the churches, say thirty years ago, a great deal of harm would have been produced as the result of faulty and misleading advice, and a false emphasis upon the negative aspect. Even in 1930, by which time a great deal of thought had been devoted to this subject, and the Bishops of the Church of England urged, at the Lambeth Conference, that the Church should undertake preparation for marriage, far too little had been done to educate the clergy in this branch of their duties. Since then, however, and partly no doubt in consequence of the resolution mentioned, increasing attention has been given to the subject, while the sources from which assistance can be obtained by the clergy have increased. To-day, for instance, the clergyman who seeks information on marriage guidance or on present-day

thought on sex education and similar subjects can secure prompt assistance from several organisations. Among these are the Central Council for Health Education, whose aid will often prove invaluable in connection with youth work; the Marriage Guidance Council, whose secretary is the Rev. David Mace, 78 Duke Street, London, W. 1, and the Society for Sex Education and Guidance, of 43 Upper Brook Street, London, W.1. Some clergymen approach these organisations with great diffidence. They need not be at all hesitant to seek their aid. All three are only too happy to be of service, for all three recognise that the clergyman is the trusted friend and adviser of a group of people, sometimes small, sometimes large, and that his influence is very considerable.

The clergyman who determines to equip himself with the necessary information with which to undertake preparation for marriage is certain to find that the knowledge thereby gained will prove helpful in his general work. The previous chapter may have given him the impression that the dangers which beset the minister who ventures into the field of psychological aid are many and dire. Let him not be dismayed. There is all the difference in the world between a deep psycho-analysis and the application in pastoral work of a general knowledge of psychological principles. The former is essentially the field of the psychological specialist. Modern psychology has undoubtedly provided a valuable weapon, indeed a whole armoury of weapons, which the parish priest can employ in the exercise of his high calling.

The more the parish priest knows of psychology the better able he will be to understand the temperament and "moods" of his parishioners. This is in itself a considerable advantage. He will certainly be able to make allowances in many cases where, formerly, a harsh judgment might have been all too hastily formed.

Whilst deep psychological investigation is a matter for the specialist, there are innumerable occasions when a brief chat with one who is acquainted with general psychological principles will work wonders, particularly if that one is trusted and admired, as the parish priest usually is by those who most frequently enlist his help. The fact must be faced, however, that the clergyman who equips himself to advise others regarding marriage and its responsibilities, must possess sound knowledge of the facts relating to the physical side of marriage. Yes, that fact must be faced, and faced resolutely—not shirked. If the priest who does this finds that he is filled with feelings of revulsion at the very idea of studying sex, let alone instructing others in the physical aspect of sex, then there is only one safe course. That is, *leave well alone*.

I know that it is unusual to say this. Most of the books so far published on this subject, and intended for the guidance of the clergy, make this part of the necessary preparatory work appear very simple. For some it is not only difficult, but actually impossible. There are clergymen whose emotional attitude to sex is such that they are quite unfitted to instruct others in the subject. This is not in the least remarkable; and it does not follow that such men are incapable of rendering excellent service in other spheres. They are simply victims, as are thousands of teachers and others in all walks of life, of an attitude to sex which for many centuries has permeated all our lives. Where this is so they do well to recognise the fact and to leave the preparation for marriage to others who are more emotionally suited to such work.

Here it may be said that there is no reason at all to assume that clergymen who are unmarried are necessarily unsuited to act as advisers in matters of sex and marriage. It is much more important that a man should have a sound emotional attitude to sex than that he should be married. There are many married men, clergymen among them of course, who cannot explain the physical relationship in a natural manner. It is useless to conceal that such men cannot helpfully instruct others in this subject. Just as teachers whose emotional attitude is immature as regards sex are unsuitable as sex instructors in schools, so are clergymen likely to do more harm than good if they force themselves, against their inclinations, to undertake marriage preparation.

Moreover, it is necessary to state frankly that the clergyman's own preparation to undertake this important work is not quite so easy as is sometimes suggested. I have before me as I write, a book in which the author, a clergyman, says: "The training required can be done so briefly and easily; given that the men were suitable and were themselves married, I, if I were equipping them, should not require more than one rather long hour's lecture and one private interview with each." No doubt such a lecture would prove helpful to many; but it is extremely improbable that any who had not read a great deal about sex, psychology, and various applications of these subjects, could be suitably prepared in so short a space of time.

It goes without saying that all who intend to be married in church may reasonably expect to be told something of the implications of Christian marriage. Often, when notice of banns has been received, a clergyman can secure the agreement of the couple concerned to attend for a chat. The incumbent who is himself reasonably free from inhibitions regarding sex can, at such a preliminary interview, pave the way for further talks, in which he can consider the applications of Christian marriage principles to the shared life which the applicants propose to live.

Such interviews can undoubtedly be of great value from the standpoint of Christian propaganda, quite apart from their effectiveness as preparation for marriage. A sound explanation of marriage from the Christian standpoint is, surely, one of the most impressive examples which could be given of Christianity in action. Some of the essentials of happy physical and emotional union are described elsewhere in this book. They will naturally find a place in such talks if discussion reveals that the proposed partners are not fully informed on the subject.

The clergyman who has prepared couples for marriage along these lines is certain to experience a feeling of added power to deal with the "human" problems of his parishioners, and he is likely to find that people will turn to him much more frequently than they formerly did, for guidance in their everyday difficulties. Often a couple who recall the advice given to them prior to marriage, will seek further interviews, when difficulties present themselves.

These "follow up" interviews are splendid opportunities, of which the fullest use should be made. Marriage, as we have noted elsewhere, is a matter of continual adjustment between the partners, and where the parish priest is asked for advice concerning such perplexing situations, he should always be prepared to help to the best of his ability. Here, of course, he will sometimes be brought face to face with problems which are beyond him. Even so, he may be instrumental in putting the inquirer into touch with someone who can do all

that is needed, and thus will gain the life-long friendship of the person he has helped.

Clergymen who find themselves emotionally unfitted to undertake definite pre-marriage instruction, and whose tendency is to turn away from the discussion of sex subjects, will often find it helpful if they know of a colleague in the neighbourhood who is successful in such work. Another method which can be applied in certain cases lies in the giving of advice regarding books which the inquirer can read. Parents, too, sometimes ask if the clergyman knows of a book which is suitable for a boy or girl of such-and-such an age. Inquiries may also be received from members of youth clubs or some department of the young people's activities. If a ready reply cannot be given, help can always be obtained from one or other of the societies mentioned earlier in this chapter. When seeking such help, it is desirable that fairly complete information should be given as to the approximate age of the person it is desired to instruct, the family and social background of the individual, and his or her educational standard. The ideal book to be given to any individual is obviously dependent on age and many other social and personal factors.

Clergymen and lay workers who are aware of the vital importance of the early formative years in our lives, sometimes ask whether they are not faced with an almost insoluble problem—a vicious circle which presents no suitable penetration-point. Their point of view has been well expressed by a clergyman who writes: "We try sex education with the boy of sixteen and find we are too late; he must be got at a younger age, and so we also say of the child of nine. When we get back to the toddler, we say: 'Of course, the trouble really is this child's parents; all kinds of things are said or done wrongly in the home.' So we carry the war of education back into the territory of the Girls' Friendly Society, or the young men's bible class, and there we are heard to mutter: 'Of course, the trouble with these people comes earlier; the harm's already done.' So back we go, and we are round the circle."

That quotation from Canon Pym's *Our Personal Ministry* sums up an attitude which is completely understandable. Undoubtedly, preparation for marriage presents the best point at which this circle can be penetrated by the clergy. But the circle must be studied at all its points, for all provide opportunities in the course of pastoral duties. It is true, for example, that during the child's first five years of life, when so much that is of vital importance in the shaping of his development takes place, the clergyman has no direct influence. He can, however, often seize upon opportunities to encourage parents to measure up to their responsibilities, and can perhaps provide just that word of guidance which will prove invaluable. Here again, the advice may lie in the direction of a book which will help. Parents are almost invariably glad of any assistance in this respect, whether it comes from a doctor or a clergyman.

There are opportunities, too, through the medium of such bodies as the Mothers' Union, of assisting many young mothers just at the time when such help can prove most effective. A very large proportion of parents who are well-informed regarding the part they can play in sex education have acquired their knowledge too late to be of advantage to their own children when young.

Finally, the clergyman has unrivalled opportunities, both by way of pastoral visitation, general influence exerted through church organisations, and preaching from the pulpit, of ever keeping before his parishioners the great

truth that the finest preparation any child can have for adult life including marriage, is to grow up in a home where there is harmony and love. Investigations have revealed time and again that those who are most likely to make a success of married life are the men and women whose childhood was spent in homes which were happy, and whose parents were well adjusted to each other. By revealing to those who eagerly listen to his words, and who value all advice which he tenders, the need for constant, deliberate attempts at adjustment at all stages of married life, the minister can not only do a great deal to promote the happiness and well-being of the married members of his congregation, but can exercise a considerable though indirect influence upon many homes. He can, indeed, help to guide what is unquestionably the most effective of all forms of sex education—that which is taking place all the time, in the home.

It is surprising that this aspect of Christian sex education has not received more attention; but no doubt it tends sometimes to be overlooked because of the large amount of attention which is, rightly, devoted to explicit, direct sex instruction. We must not make the mistake, in days when we are wisely expanding provision for sex education, of overlooking the vital importance of the preacher's pulpit message. It can go far towards creating the right atmosphere for all other effort. It is a sphere of service, too, in which much excellent work can be done by many clergymen who, for reasons which we considered earlier, may feel themselves unfitted for straightforward sex instruction.

There is another aspect of this subject which is worth noting, since it is rarely touched upon—the close link which help in marital and sex questions helps to create between church and home. The demand that the church should relate its message to the problems of everyday life has come from both church and secular quarters. As a recent Archbishop of Canterbury expressed it: "We appear to be largely preoccupied with dogmatic and ecclesiastical questions remote from common concerns. And so religion seems to remain in a backwater, while the main streams of life flow past it, untouched and unaffected." What are the "common concerns" of the people? Surely, the personal, "human" problems of sex and marriage must take first place among them.

Thus while the application of Christian principles to social and economic problems interests many, the help which the Church can give in the sphere of sex re-education and guidance provides a means of entry into the close, personal interests of every man, woman and child. This field of boundless opportunities is being cautiously entered and explored by a small but growing number of clergy and workers. Experience will strengthen confidence and deepen knowledge. Side by side with the Church's effort, a secular movement of rapidly-growing strength and ever-widening scope is active, part of it officially inspired and directed, as in the schools. The possibilities are limitless.

Humanity's dire need constitutes the biggest challenge to the Churches. Man's extremity may prove to be the Church's opportunity.

CHAPTER XIV

THE "INTERMEDIATE SEX"

"THERE are transitional forms between the metals and non-metals; between chemical combinations and simple mixtures, between animals and plants, between mammals and birds. . . . The improbability may henceforth be taken for granted of finding in Nature a sharp cleavage between all that is masculine on the one side and all that is feminine on the other; or that any living being is so simple in this respect that it can be put wholly on one side, or wholly on the other, of the line."

O. WEININGER.

The authority quoted at the head of this chapter has expressed the view that all human characteristics are based upon the presence of both male and female plasm in all living tissues. Inevitably, both male and female traits result, and these are discernible in the physical and psychological spheres. Using *capital* letters to indicate *mental* factors, and *small* letters for *bodily* ones, we can express the total personality as follows:

M plus m plus F plus f.

That stands for all of us, the *M* and *m* meaning male, and the *F* and *f* meaning female. We are all represented as individuals with masculine and feminine characteristics in both the physical and psychological planes. Yet when we observe human beings we recognise some as being males, others as females. Very little consideration will reveal that this classification is made entirely by reference to physical characteristics—the small *m* and *f* above. We do not study the mental or emotional make-up of a person before deciding whether a male or a female stands before us. We note at a glance the physical characteristics. In a flash we register the impression—male or female.

Only the small letters count, then, so far as the determination of sex is concerned, since the test is entirely upon which side, male or female, the preponderance occurs on a physical basis. But while "m" may exceed "f" in a given case, with the result that the individual concerned is recognised as being a male, it by no means follows that there will be a similar preponderance of masculine characteristics in the mental and psychological spheres. On the contrary, we know that there are many instances where masculine physical characteristics are coupled with marked feminine mental and psychological attributes.

It is very important to realise this. According to Weininger, and I do not quarrel with his view, "M" and "F" are complementary. A large "M" should be followed by a small "f", a large "F" by a small "m", the person concerned being either physically a man with predominantly masculine mental and psychological characteristics, or else a woman with feminine emotional attitudes uppermost, those of either sex having *some* emotional traits "borrowed" from the opposite sex.

Now if at the outset we accept *M plus m plus F plus f* as a rough and ready indication of our make-up, physical and emotional, we can see, rather

more easily than would otherwise be possible, how we develop through various stages of growth from this assortment of masculine and feminine characteristics until, in adulthood, if all goes well, we become "normal" men and women. It is as well to place that word in quotation marks, since it is extremely doubtful that a completely normal man or woman exists, or has ever existed—a point which should be borne in mind by those who are over-proud of their "normality" when brought face to face with the difficulties of others who may be less fortunate!

At the outset, masculine and feminine characteristics may be more or less equal, but some preponderance on one side or the other has established our sex—an excess of physical characteristics of male over female, or vice versa. But what of the large letters which represent our emotional sex characteristics? Normally, striving to expand the "M" at the expense of the "F", or the "F" at the expense of the "M", would result in the masculinity or femininity in our mental and psychological make-up becoming, in time, as marked as it is in our physical development. But sometimes this emotional development is retarded or arrested. This happens in individuals of both sexes. In adult life we may balance the large "M" with an equally large "F," in which case a person possessing the male physical characteristics would in his mental outlook and emotional make-up be as much a woman as a man. Or the balance may not be evenly maintained, but may swing right over, so that a woman, physically, may have developed a large "M" in place of the large "F" which would mark a feminine psychological state.

Thus it is, I think, easy to understand how an "intermediate sex" has come into existence. In most cases the "men-women," the "she-men," of whom we hear so much, and against whom so much abuse is hurled, are not "perverts" who have deliberately chosen to walk a different road from that taken by the majority of people. They are, in the truest sense of the term, victims of circumstance, usually of circumstances over which they have had no control.

We have seen that Weininger has expressed the opinion that it is improbable that "any living being is so simple in this respect that it can be put wholly on one side, or wholly on the other, of the line." It has been my experience, and I think it is one shared by all who have had a great deal to do with the treatment of psychological maladjustments, that all men and women, without exception, possess both masculine and feminine attributes in varying proportions. I believe that this is necessary to our well-being. The entirely masculine man and the completely feminine woman, if we could imagine such creatures, would not lead very happy lives. It is the touch of femininity in men which gives them an insight into a woman's deepest needs. That profound understanding of a man's fundamental desires which women sometimes possess—and which undoubtedly springs from the element of the masculine within their own natures—contributes much to the enrichment of life. It is something precious, something to be prized and maintained. The recognition that there is a trace of the woman in every man, and something of the man in every woman, is essential to the achievement of the best results in human co-operation. I think it can be said without exaggeration that if there were not this blending of masculine and feminine qualities in both sexes, social life between the sexes would be difficult, if not impossible.

It may be helpful if we look upon men and women not primarily as creatures who are divided into two sexes but as *human beings*. At the outset

sex is in an undifferentiated state. Usually, development yields clearly-marked physical sex characteristics, although there do occur extreme cases of hermaphroditism, in which the organs of both sexes are present in the one individual. But in the overwhelming majority of cases there is development, physically, towards maleness or femaleness, and generally there is development, emotionally, side by side with the physical growth. Rarely, and in my view never, does this development proceed in absolutely clear-cut fashion. Up to a point, therefore, bisexuality must be regarded as normal. It involves development in which features of masculinity and femininity are present, although in varying degrees in different individuals.

Normally a child is born with the genital organs of either a male or a female. Whether or not he will develop an appropriate psychological attitude depends upon many factors, particularly upon his passing successfully through certain stages of development. But where psychological bisexuality is more marked than in most cases the organism is predisposed towards homosexuality, that is, towards having the sex urge find its expression in some form of intercourse with its own, instead of the opposite sex. The action of psychological factors may easily cause the basic sex urge to be diverted away from the normal, into a homosexual channel. It seems reasonably certain that the true homosexual is one who, predisposed already, has had experiences in early life which have resulted in his sex expression being fastened upon those of his own sex.

But while, as I have said, the child is usually born with the genital organs of either a male or a female, the two sexes are very much alike at birth. It is necessary to inspect the genital system in order to ascertain the sex of the baby. The two sexes remain very much alike in general bodily features up to the age of five or six. During these early years the auto-erotic stage of development is proceeding. The child regards himself and the world as one. He knows only himself. *He* is his world. His constant aim is comfort. The only instrument he can employ to attain that end is his own body. Naturally, his body claims his attention most of the time.

Although at the outset he does not realise it, his mother is part of this little world which, to the child, is everything, and she—and her breasts from which the child draws sustenance—seem to be part of himself. Gradually, however, the child becomes conscious of the mother's separate existence. He is astonished to learn that there is another person in the world; but since that person is one who co-operates very closely with his own efforts to attain bodily comfort, her presence is not disturbing, but comforting. Ministering all the time to his needs, inevitably she becomes the child's first love object.

So far, everything is satisfactory from the child's point of view. But suddenly there comes a shock. The child discovers that this world of security and comfort in which his mother counts for so much is not, after all, entirely his. He begins to realise that his father claims some of the mother's attention and love. What had hitherto seemed to be his own exclusive "right," the complete love and constant help of his mother, must be shared in part with another. Here is the little fellow's introduction to the basic social problem, for, for the first time in his life, he is brought face to face with the conflicting demands of self and society—his childish demand for security in comfort on the one hand, and the claims of that small society, the family, on the other.

Acceptance of the idea of a *dual* relationship, to father and mother instead of to the one parent, may open the way to that measure of adjustment which is necessary. But this acceptance and consequent adjustment are not always forthcoming. The child who can accept this dual relationship is likely to succeed in adapting himself to the demands of family life, and, in later years, to the demands of social life and of "groups" which demand loyalty. Growth proceeds along normal lines, for a "social" solution to the problem has been found.

Not every child, however, resolves the difficulty thus happily. Finding that the love which he regarded as his alone must be shared with another, the child may develop extremely aggressive feelings towards his father. At times he may feel that he would like nothing better than that harm should befall his father. He may even feel that he would like personally to do his father some injury. Here we have the beginning of revolt—first against the father, and later against authority generally. When such thoughts arise they may be crushed instantly as being unworthy; but they come again. The child's conscience may disturb him in consequence, for it may seem to him a dreadful thing that he should experience such cruel feelings of aggression against his father. The very strength of his feeling of aggression may make him afraid. Thus he may be at war with himself, and being at war with himself he finds himself at war with society. Having failed to find the social solution of his problem as a child, he may become in adult years an anti-social, "rebel" type. The shadow of his early aggressive feeling towards his father darkens his outlook throughout life, for he carries with him a lurking sense of guiltiness as well as the fear which invariably accompanies feelings of guilt.

It may seem surprising that such a crop of difficulties should spring from nothing more than a child's sudden realisation that his mother's love is not his alone; but it must be remembered that the threat which confronts the child is a shattering one, involving everything which matters to the child and seeming to indicate the early end of his whole world of security, comfort, and happiness. Anger and resentment; feelings of hostility and aggression towards the father; a disturbed conscience; a sense of shame; fear regarding certain tendencies which are clearly felt, and are recognised as being unworthy—here, surely, is enough explosive material to produce an emotional upheaval! Deep down in the sexual make-up lurks latent hostility, fear, shame, unworthiness, and the feelings of inadequacy which such haunting terrors yield. Small wonder that this legacy of emotional explosive material may lead to difficulties throughout life, including, probably, a faulty direction of sex expression.

The child may, however, find another solution to the problem which realisation of the dual relationship presents. He may identify himself very closely with his mother, *particularly as regards her relationship to his father*. This enables him to accept his father's love for the mother, and even to rejoice in it; but inevitably the close identification of the child with his mother tends to produce a wish to share her role. Here we have what is perhaps the simplest explanation of a situation in which the seeds of true homosexuality are likely to take root.

Note the words "true homosexuality," for I shall have to indicate later that there are some people who indulge in homosexual practices yet are not genuine homosexuals. It will be seen from the explanation given in the preceding paragraphs that those in whom genuine homosexual tendencies

exist are the casualties of a battle fought when they were very young indeed, with no knowledge of the issues at stake, and with no allies to aid them. There is widespread interest in the subject of homosexuality at the present time, and proposals are not lacking for the segregation or other "control" of those unfortunate enough to be endowed with marked homosexual traits. I trust that the foregoing explanation will contribute towards a more sympathetic approach to the whole problem, and a deeper understanding of the difficulties which confront so many of our brother men and sister women.

Naturally, parents to-day are deeply concerned to act wisely in their relations with their children in view of the wider recognition than formerly that early influences exercise a great effect upon the child, and often throughout life. It is desirable, therefore, to go rather more fully into the subject from the "family" standpoint. The bare psychological facts, roughly as I have stated them, are becoming more generally known, but they do not in themselves guide parents towards a sound relationship with their children, and in a good many cases undoubtedly serve only to alarm them. Nothing could be worse than that parents should be constantly and anxiously looking for signs of homosexual traits in their children. Yet I am certain that one of the results of a little knowledge of the psychological facts relating to homosexuality is sometimes a deplorable tendency to see homosexual traits were none exist.

The first thing for the parent to bear well in mind is that at the outset the child possesses no definite love attitudes. In order that a boy may acquire a sound masculine love attitude, or a girl a sound feminine attitude to sex, a long period of growth is necessary. There are obstacles to be overcome at every stage. Correct sex attitudes are acquired through experiences of many kinds. Sometimes knowledge which is imparted in words may help; but a child's experiences, from the earliest days, count for most.

Here we may note that the nature and quality of love which mothers bestow upon their children varies a great deal. There are, for instance, some fickle mothers. They are extravagant in their love one day, cold and aloof the next. There are mothers of unwanted children who do not succeed in disguising (and possibly do not even attempt to do so) the fact that the child is unwanted. It may seem that this is very regrettable, but that it can have little connection with homosexuality. But sometimes the child who feels unwanted may develop homosexual tendencies.

To the very young child, every touch means much. We have already noted how the child tends to incorporate within its own personality the personalities of those who minister to its various requirements in infancy, and that sometimes this tendency may result in complete identification with one of the parents. It is clear from this that the child is extremely sensitive to every mood of the parents, and particularly to the one to whom he is emotionally attached. The unconscious attitude of the adult cannot be completely hidden from the highly sensitive little organism. The tone of the voice, the expression on the face, the slight shrug of the shoulders, all mean much, even though the child may be too young to understand the meaning of any words which may be uttered.

That tone of voice, that expression on the face, that gesture of impatience, will not be lost on the child. Such things may speak more loudly than words. They may say, in effect: "I didn't want you, and I still don't want you!" The child will understand. No matter what spoken endearments or dutiful caresses

may be employed, these will not deceive the child. He will know that he is not wanted. He will realise the truth, for truth it is, that the unwanted child does not receive its full measure of love. In later life the results of such a realisation may be far-reaching. "Normal love is not for me" may be the attitude in adulthood; normal love being excluded, the sex urge seeks expression along other than normal lines, very possibly in a homosexual direction.

It is inevitable, when considering such a subject as homosexuality, that we should keep casting a glance at the child in infancy, then consider him as an adult. To trace the progress through the years of a number of individuals, even two or three, would involve very lengthy descriptions of a kind likely to weary the lay reader. It is advisable, however, to stress the fact that from the time when the child discovers that there are others besides himself in the world, with the result that his thoughts begin to turn outward from himself to others, until the time he reaches adulthood, a vast amount of emotional experience is undergone. Thoughts turn to one, possibly both, of his parents; these claim his interest to an extent which adults find hard to realise. It is not a matter of interest in his parents shared with a number of other interests, such as adults experience, but an all-absorbing, extremely intense interest. If all goes well, if development proceeds smoothly, freedom from the "fixation" on one or both parents will be achieved. The direction of the interest will still be outward, but now towards a love-object of the opposite sex. It takes only a few seconds in which to read of that growth from infancy to adulthood, but it is a long journey when it has to be lived. Is it surprising that some find themselves diverted along byways instead of keeping to the main road of normal development? There are some byways which every child comes to in the course of the journey from infancy to adulthood, and it is very helpful if parents are aware of these.

Sometimes parents inquire which is the homosexual stage in the child's growth. They have seen references in books to such a phase of development, and usually they assume that this relates to the period around puberty. It is true that there are often homosexual tendencies at that time, but by "homosexual stage" is meant a period beginning earlier than puberty. The term relates to the time when children take a keen interest in organisations confined to members of their own sex. This represents a perfectly natural tendency. It should be recognized as such by parents, for it is a necessary phase in the somewhat complicated programme of development. The child's interest is no longer concentrated upon himself, nor is it entirely limited to his own family. It is beginning to spread out in a wider circle.

The boy indulges in manly pursuits. Boys' Brigades, the Boy Scouts, various sports, possibly membership of a "gang," appeal to him. He does not think much of girls—in more senses than one! If he is compelled to pass an opinion on them, it is apt to be a very unflattering one! Girls are, during this period, merely nuisances as sisters; they have to be "borne," more or less patiently, but they are in a class apart from boys, and that definitely a lower one! The adult male who "looks down" upon women is suffering from a form of emotional retardation, being still at this pre-puberty stage in his attitude to the opposite sex.

At this period of development girls are apt to regard boys as being noisy, impudent, and possibly a trifle coarse. They tend to draw closer together, and

to find common interests in clothes and feminine activities generally. As we know, at this stage they sometimes develop "crushes." Parents often are alarmed when their daughter becomes ardently attached to some other girl, or when their son becomes an inseparable "pal" of another boy, or even gives the appearance of having fallen in love with a somewhat older boy whose prowess in sports or in some other field may have fired his imagination.

Of course, such "crushes" and other manifestations incidental to this phase may have their elements of danger. On the whole, however, it is wise to recognise that all this is a necessary and healthful preparation for adult life. These close friendships may continue well into the adolescent period, or even beyond.

Meanwhile, puberty is reached, and entirely fresh ideas, thoughts and feelings occupy the mind, as on the physical side the ability to participate in sexual intercourse marks a further stage of development. To some boys this stage brings a sense of greater power; to others, nothing but confusion and fear. It is a trying time for both sexes, coming as it does in the middle of what has been termed the homosexual stage. Generally, girls begin to take an interest in boys at a somewhat earlier age than boys feel sexually attracted to girls; the girl of fourteen may find boys extremely interesting, whereas the average boy of that age, still absorbed in his friendship with other boys, has little time or inclination for girls. It is usually at about the age of sixteen that the boy experiences marked sexual attraction towards girls.

It goes without saying that the parent who realises that these tendencies are proper and natural in boys and girls at different stages of their development will usually adopt a much more enlightened and helpful attitude than the one who judges children by adult standards. Agonies of mind have to be endured by the boy of nine or ten who longs to spend all his time with friends of his own sex, but whose parents are certain that plenty of mixed parties and opportunities to meet little girl friends and acquaintances will help to "bring him out." They will do nothing of the sort; they will drive him deeper into himself, and may make him very "moody." Acceptance by parents of the fact that a so-called "homosexual stage" exists, and that it plays a necessary and valuable part in the forming of adult emotional make-up, will banish a good deal of unnecessary parental anxiety, and help to make parents good friends to their children, which they ought to be.

Ideally, of course, boys and girls should pass through the various stages of emotional development without undue strain, profiting by each one of them to the full, then passing easily and naturally to the next. But few are able to pass from stage to stage without experiencing some emotional strain. Not many succeed in casting off completely the emotional accompaniments of each stage passed. Indeed, it is safe to say that the man or woman who attains adult years with all infantile or adolescent traits completely discarded, does not exist. Faulty emotional fixations, possibly of a homosexual character, are retained by many. The majority of adults retain some infantile habits of thought, or carry with them feelings of shame or fear which belong to childhood or adolescence and should have been discarded long since. It is as well to remember these facts. Far too many people worry about traits which they are conscious they possess, but which do not interfere at all seriously with the living of a happy and useful life. Where there is no real interference with the living of a sensible and reasonably happy life there is not the slightest need

for concern. There is no need to feel ashamed because we are conscious of certain traits which yield no marked ill effect; forces within ourselves, others which arise from our day-to-day experience, and still others which are inherent in our social conventions, make our progress from one stage of development to another at best somewhat difficult, and possibly extremely difficult.

In the lives of individuals, as in the lives of societies and nations, nothing is entirely lost. In an ideal functioning of the process of growth, we should carry with us, out of each stage of development, certain attitudes which, although they are relevant to the stage, will be useful in adult life only when they are transformed or adjusted to meet adult requirements. The habits and outlook of the days of infancy are part of ourselves; so, too, are those of puberty. But they cannot contribute towards the enrichment of adult life unless they have been sublimated—that is, transformed so that they will be capable of working at the next and higher level, and, later, at the further levels as we proceed from stage to stage of our development. If they are not sublimated, if they are not thus adapted for use in our more advanced stage of development, they do not cease to exist. They remain in some form or other.

Let me give an example. We have seen that at an early age children are keenly interested in their own bodies—for a time interested solely in their own bodies. Sometimes they discover a particular source of pleasurable sensation in their genital regions, and this may result in "infantile masturbation." In the main, parents do not know that this is *not* a sign of degeneracy. They see in it a startling indication that the child, apparently, has been tainted from birth, and their horror inevitably is impressed upon the child, whether by means of punishments or what is often worse, by means of facial expressions of horror. A child may have acquired, very early in life, the impression that anything to do with the genital region is nasty, simply because of parental disapproval of his infantile masturbation expressed in some such emphatic manner.

Later, the same child may play with a little friend of the opposite sex, and, prompted by curiosity which is natural and necessary if he is to learn, he may seek to discover more about his companion. A parent, looking, may witness what takes place, and may call out loudly in order to stop the mutual revelations. The look on the parent's face may remain in the child's mind for a long time. Even when the incident is forgotten, in the ordinary sense of the term, the look of horror on that loved parent's face will appear, somewhere in the deep, inner recesses of the mind, to cry "Stop!" to certain forms of sexual activity, possibly to *every* form of sexual expression.

Such shocks as these often result either in arrested development or in retarded growth. The emotional stage at which these shocks occur may not be passed satisfactorily although the individual may develop physically to the full stature and mentally to a stage of exceptional advancement. Thus it is that we find fully grown adults possessing strongly marked characteristics of infancy, particularly in the realm of sex—husbands who are in the infant class, wives who emotionally are children. Is it surprising that such people may fail to make a success of their marriages?

Long after puberty has been reached and passed, when physical preparation for participation in the complete sexual act has been fully made by Nature, such people may be incapable of coitus, or, at any rate, find it distasteful, or in

some other respect are unable to participate fully and happily in normal sexual relations. *Yet the basic sex urge is still present.*

That is the point to note. It is not lost as some suppose. On the contrary, it may be extremely strong. But it cannot find expression through normal channels. Demanding expression, but denied an outlet through normal sexual relations, it becomes diverted. Some sort of substitute for the real thing, which is coitus, provides the necessary outlet. And this may take the form of a desire for homosexual practices.

This desire for sex experience which is other than normal, and which in many cases assumes a homosexual aspect, arises from the fact that normal sex experience is unwelcome. But why is it unwelcome? The answer is that the "unconscious conscience," the censorship hidden in the depths of the unconscious, forbids it. We cannot easily "nail down" this power which can exercise so strong an influence over our lives. We are more likely to perceive its power, and the way in which this power is exercised, by studying others than by trying to solve the mysteries of our own fears, tendencies, and actions. Deep within us is a sense of guiltiness, a frightening power which seems constantly to threaten us, and which can prevent action by its threats. It seems to take unto itself anything which strengthens its power to intimidate us. It is immensely encouraged and strengthened when it can add to its armoury of weapons the horrified face of a parent, as in the case described, or the pain of a punishment inflicted in circumstances which are associated with a sense of shame.

Not only may homosexual aims result from such upsets as I have described, but various others, some of which are of an exceedingly complicated nature. The precise *form* of homosexual practice to which a person feels drawn may be accounted for by the kind of shock which has interfered with normal emotional growth.

As we have seen that sublimation, the transformation of the habits and traits of one development stage so that they can strengthen the emotional life at later and higher levels, is necessary to sound emotional development. Here it is necessary to go into this subject rather more fully, for all who are interested in homosexuality invariably attach great importance to sublimation, sometimes, it is to be feared, expecting it to work miracles to order! There are, for instance, some writers who assume that true homosexuals need only accept advice to "sublimate" their traits by seeking some form of social or welfare work, and all will be well. Some homosexuals strive pathetically to discover a form of sublimation which will solve their problems. Alas, it is not as simple as that. Sublimation is an unconscious process. We cannot consciously sublimate our tendencies, our habits, or our desires, as we shall see later in this volume. Sublimation is a natural process, and if some form of activity helps to provide this transforming process, depend upon it we have taken up such work because it appeals to us. We like it, therefore we do it. We cannot choose to be "sublimated" at will.

Here, all we need to discuss is what happens if at one or other of the stages of growth there is no sublimation, or only partial sublimation. The emotional growth then cannot proceed reasonably smoothly, and *substitution* takes place. In other words, in place of a step forward which should be successfully undertaken, we substitute something else—something which seems easier, less dangerous, further removed from the condemnation of that

deep, innermost "unconscious conscience" to which reference has been made—a force which is so powerful in all our lives that we shall devote the next chapter to it.

These substitutions assume many different forms. They may, and, indeed, usually do, remain basically unchanged. But the actions to which they lead, the precise conscious tendencies to which they give rise, may change as fresh experiences and new opportunities provide outlets for their expression. A lengthy chapter would be needed to describe, even briefly, the many common "substitute" tendencies and activities to which the basic substitutions give rise. In adults the wide range of infantile substitutions includes masturbation; indulgence in love-play in its various forms as an end in itself, instead of as an essential preliminary to coitus; various forms of fetishism; homosexual practices, and many others. They are all substitutes for the real thing—normal, complete intercourse with a member of the opposite sex. And if we trace them back to their origin, we find that all these substitutes for the real thing in adult life began at some stage as substitutes, for advances which normal development demanded, but which for some reason or other were feared, and therefore, avoided.

It is the failure of our deepest inner selves, often called the *super-ego*, to grow up, which accounts for many of these relapses into infantile traits and habits, and for many of the difficulties which we experience as adults. Our conscious understanding advances as we learn, but the *super-ego* does not advance. It remains stubbornly on the watch, prepared to step in and stop any action of which it disapproves. The *super-ego* which refuses to grow up is invariably on the watch for the slightest indication that the basic sexual impulse is about to find expression. This *super-ego* is a part of ourselves; yet it plays a repressive part, and insists upon interfering with us even when we attempt to do what our reason informs us is sound and right, and what our conscience—the conscience of which we are conscious—willingly approves.

Thus there is an eternal conflict within us. We desire to do various things which we believe, perhaps know, are natural and necessary. Yet the warning voice from deep within threatens us with the direst penalties if we obey even our deepest, basic urges, and particularly, the driving, intense sex urge. Sooner or later there is bound to be a degree of tension which demands relief. What then?

If we cannot achieve the satisfaction we need directly, we resort to roundabout methods. These take many different forms. The displacement of the basic aim may occur; that is to say, one part of the body may replace another part. There we have the explanation of some kinds of fetishism. Or it may be that the organism feels—in effect—that it would be worth while to test the effect of the actions which the terrifying *super-ego* condemns. There we have the process of "testing out" which accounts for much naughtiness in children, their object being to ascertain whether all the penalties threatened for those who do this or that really do follow, and whether the deed and the satisfaction it yields outweigh the penalties. Many adults follow much the same process, and for much the same reason.

All these, and many other steps which could be mentioned, are attempts to secure by roundabout means what, but for the warning voice of the *super-ego*, would be gained by direct expression of the sexual urge. They are

substitutes. They take the place of direct satisfaction. But *sublimation is also a substitute*.

Sometimes the substitution follows lines which are socially desirable, which conscience can approve, and which arouse no protest from the deeper censor, the super-ego. Various forms of social service are said to represent the sublimation of the basic sexual impulse, because they provide an outlet for much of the otherwise unsatisfied urge to unite with another, to share in the work of physical creation. Many people sneer at such "socially respectable" forms of sexual satisfaction. The fact remains that those who, often unknowingly, are in effect placing their sex drive at the disposal of others, to serve and to uplift, have performed a vast amount of service to the community.

It has often been observed that homosexuals are exceptionally active in reforming and uplifting movements; undoubtedly this is due, in part, to the struggle which many of these afflicted people, for such they really are, make to adjust themselves to the life about them. Their skill in creative work, and their often pronounced artistic ability, are also indications of sublimation, rarely, no doubt, complete, but nevertheless there—a sign that these homosexuals are striving to make the best of themselves in spite of all their difficulties, and are anxious to contribute what they can to the life of the community.

To most people homosexuality is extremely unpleasant; the very word may occasion a shiver of disgust. Certainly some of the practices associated with it are ugly and revolting. But there are many homosexuals who do not "practice." They observe continence. That they often suffer considerably from the effects of the frustration of the basic sex urge, there can be little doubt. Sublimation may help them to some extent, possibly to a considerable extent; but it rarely eliminates the feeling of war within, and the conflict between what they feel disposed to do and what society decrees.

If we are to attain a sound outlook upon homosexuality, it is essential that we should realise that it is not so far removed from normality as some suppose. Man is bisexual. Of that there can be no doubt. When people are compelled to spend lengthy periods exclusively in the company of members of their own sex, whether in prison, in camps, or in schools, homosexual practices often result. Yet these people may not be homosexuals in the true sense. Indeed, many of them return to normal sexual activity immediately the circumstances of their lives are restored to normal. That is a fact which should be more widely known than it is.

What should be our attitude towards homosexuals? I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that it should be one of tolerance—sympathetic tolerance. Very few homosexuals have deliberately and wilfully chosen to be other than normal. If they had said: "To-day, and henceforth, I will eschew normality in my sexual expression, and will be a homosexual," there would be a case for treating homosexuality as a crime. But as it is homosexuals are deserving of pity. They need sympathetic treatment. They exist, in fact, because we *all* have failed. They are largely, perhaps entirely, the result of our false attitude towards sex. Prison sentences will not re-direct the sex urge of a single homosexual into normal channels. Only one thing, indeed, will avail in the fight against homosexuality; that is sound sex education, or, more properly, sex *re*-education. That alone will reduce the number of homosexuals, slowly, it is true. It is the one constructive and useful avenue of approach to the problem.

All that is wrong with these people is that their desire, almost through no fault of their own, is wrongly directed. Many of them are persons of high moral character who fight all their lives against giving expression to the urge within them. Let us give them full credit for that—for fighting an appallingly hard battle against odds the like of which many of us have never had to face. Let us do that—and, while we do so, let us adopt an attitude of humble gratitude that the precious gifts which only normality can bestow are ours. Well may we cry: "There, but for the grace of God, go I!" The same sort of trifling accident which has made some of us bullies to our staffs, but cringing cowards before our wives; or strong "he-men" before our wives, full of masterful ways, but meek, submissive little fellows at the office; the kind of little psychological twist which causes you, when you kick your poor cat in the dark, to blame the unfortunate animal for what was your own fault—it is things like these which have made some people into homosexuals. We ought not to feel mightily superior if we have the precious gift of normality; rather should we cherish it and, at the same time, sympathise with those who are "different." The attitude of far too many people who consider, very often erroneously, that they themselves are "completely normal" is that attributed to the inhabitants of some out-of-the-way villages when someone who does not speak the local dialect, or share the local enthusiasms, appears among them—"Here's a stranger; heave a brick at him!"

It is often assumed by the ignorant that all homosexuals are devoted to a certain unnatural practice which is not only a serious criminal offence, but which is extremely repellent to most people. This is not so. *Many homosexuals do not practise any form of sexual expression in the physical sense.* Often the deeds of bisexuals, or of what are sometimes termed "elderly roués," are laid, quite falsely, at the doors of homosexuals, and even in these cases a measure of sympathetic understanding is often called for, since the elderly men concerned are often the victims of failing powers, with a tendency to revert to childish inclinations expressive of one of those earlier development stages we have traced.

Earlier in this chapter I used the term "true homosexuality." It is necessary to make a distinction between those who are true homosexuals and others who, while indulging in various homosexual practices, cannot be regarded as genuine homosexuals—those, for instance, who have foolishly experimented in this field and have acquired a habit for practices which cannot compensate for normal sexual expression. It is probable that in such cases a measure of predisposition towards homosexuality may have been present. Otherwise it is difficult to understand how anyone can find it tolerable, let alone pleasurable, to have relations with those of his own sex. Even so, it is undeniable that some people are encouraged to "try out" homosexual practices, often on the grounds that they believe in "trying anything once." Others form an attachment to someone of their own sex in the belief that all the best people, or the intellectual people, or the artistic people—among the Nazi youth it was all the bravest people!—are homosexuals.

It is true that homosexuals, as a rule, are very sensitive people; and they are sensitive to the wrongs committed against others. They themselves are often subjected to abuse and ill-treatment of various kinds. Instead of becoming bitter against the world in general, they usually seem to become excep-

tionally sympathetic to others, thus they are often well to the fore in work for good causes and for schemes of social reformation. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand why some people should imagine that homosexuality is a sign of a progressive outlook and reforming zeal. The delicate good taste which many homosexuals possess also is notable; many of them excel in artistic pursuits. These facts are undeniable. But obviously they do not constitute sound reasons for experimentation in homosexual practices, although they might well cause us all to adopt a more kindly attitude towards homosexuals.

It is hoped that the foregoing will prove of some assistance to the reader, partly in enabling him to view the many problems associated with homosexuality in an informed, kindly, and reasonable manner, and also by serving as a warning to parents to exercise the greatest care not to be unduly rigid, or to reveal feelings of fear or horror in their dealings with the sexual curiosity of their children. But something more has to be said arising out of our discussion of this subject.

Whilst it is true that the more marked homosexual phase gradually passes into the phase of hetero-sexuality, in which full intercourse with a member of the opposite sex becomes the sexual aim, certain elements of what may roughly be described as homosexuality remain. This is true of both sexes. We have all heard the remark: "Boys will be boys" when a body of men disport themselves at club or sportsfield. It is perfectly true; the boy in them is finding expression—a natural and proper thing. The clubs which exist for men only, the organisations, like Freemasonry, with a strict male basis, are very necessary to some men. Professor Flugel, in his book *Man and His Motives*, points out that men form clubs and societies more readily than do women, and this he attributes to their inhibited homosexual tendencies. Women, on the other hand, find that their lesser homosexuality is satisfied by the overt demonstrations which society permits them to make towards members of their own sex. Thus feminine social organisations are not so much required by women as are male societies by men. There are, of course, women who delight in spending time in the company of other women, and, especially when such companionship is linked with a common purpose, women's organisations meet a real need.

It is necessary for married people to recognise this part of our make-up which seeks the company of others of our own sex; otherwise, they may find it hard to understand why the partner in marriage wishes to spend time at a club or some other organisation with members of his or her own sex. If we were not bisexual in our make-up, life in the fighting services would be intolerable, whether for men or for those women who serve in the various auxiliary formations. Our full urge is not directed towards the opposite sex; there is something reserved for our own sex, and this makes us sociable beings, able to get along well in company irrespective of sex.

Many a marriage has suffered because of a lack of sympathetic understanding of this fact. Husbands sometimes show—or *feel*—resentment at their wives' friends. Wives sometimes feel that it ought not to be necessary for their husbands to have close male friends, and particularly not to spend time with them, away from home. Needless to say, selfishness is not to be encouraged or condoned; far from it. But sympathetic understanding of the make-up of the two sexes is a helpful guide to wise conduct in marriage. All that we know of the psychological tendencies of men and women alike indicates the wisdom

of (1) Allowing each other a reasonable expression of the total self within the marriage circle; and (2) Realising particularly that towards middle age, and especially, perhaps, between the ages of about 40 and 50, there is usually a desire on the part of both men and women to associate more with their own sex than at other times. This desire should be respected by both partners.

CHAPTER XV

OVERTHROWING SEX DICTATORSHIP

IF, to-morrow, all laws and regulations were suddenly to be cancelled, and people were to be free to do exactly as they pleased, should we have attained sexual freedom?

Happily, it is hard to imagine sweeping revolutions of this kind occurring in this country. But it is worth while to try and picture such a sudden change. By doing so we shall be able to understand, perhaps more clearly than by any other means, the real nature of sexual slavery and of sexual freedom.

Let us consider, then, a day when the newspapers come out with bold headlines heralding the new policy of sexual freedom. The Archbishop of Canterbury announces that, henceforth, the Church of England will stand for uncontrolled sexual expression, and the leaders of the other religious communities quickly follow his lead. The powerful voice of the B.B.C. is heard in millions of homes bidding us to listen-in to the Sex Front at nine each morning, when well-known leaders of thought and activity will give advice on ways and means of utilising to the full the opportunities presented by the new policy.

No doubt, if church and state were to adopt such a policy, the B.B.C. could oblige with a swarm of experts able to inform us of the advantages of casting off the old restraints, just as, during the war, when potatoes were plentiful, although many other foodstuffs were in short supply, they were able to tell a multitude of astonished women that potatoes were not *really* fattening after all!

With platform, pulpit, press and radio, together with all the propaganda pressure which bureaucracy in its many forms can bring to bear, all working on behalf of the New Order of Sexual Freedom, with all legal restrictions removed and with religious encouragement granted, the advocates of sexual freedom would surely feel that their wildest dreams had come true. All that they had demanded, and much more, would have been granted in a flash.

But would you be sexually free thereafter? That is the question which matters. Would all the vast surface changes we have assumed ensure genuine sexual freedom for any considerable number of individuals, or would men and women, in the main, be in precisely the same condition as before?

Fundamentally, so far as you and I as individuals were concerned, the position would be as before. In spite of the sweeping changes *outside of us*, we ourselves would be little affected, at the start at any rate. For the real sex dictatorship is not enthroned in Whitehall or Canterbury, but deep within our own minds.

Inevitably, we are all influenced by the background of our lives. No doubt

many people would use the wider opportunities to express what was already within them; others, however, although granted precisely similar facilities, would find themselves unable to take advantage of them. Many who sought to do so would find their efforts a miserable failure. For the truth is that, while such sweeping changes as we have visualised would provide fresh avenues of expression, they would not change us at all. We are what we are. The outward conditions cannot affect our essential natures.

One reason, indeed, I think the main reason, why some people advocate surface changes of the kind mentioned, is that they do not recognise the difference between *openings* for expression and the thing which is to be expressed. To say, as some do when this is pointed out to them, that really there is only one thing requiring expression, namely, the basic sexual instinct, and that efforts towards sexual freedom need only be directed towards ensuring the freest field for its satisfaction, is to over-simplify the problem. Of fifty men and fifty women, each one possesses the sexual urge in some shape or form, but the precise shape and form may differ in each individual from all the others.

When we take one hundred adults and consider them in relation to the problem of free sexual expression, immediately we are faced with the undeniable fact that each one of them has undergone experiences, using that term in its widest sense, which in some way or other have affected the basic sexual impulse, not necessarily as regards its strength, though that may be so; not necessarily as regards its real nature, which probably remains fundamentally unchanged. But this basic natural urge cannot find expression in a perfectly natural manner. This is not due to lack of opportunities. These may be present in ample measure, yet the response to them may be absent or negligible.

It is safe to say that no matter how carefully they had been selected not one of our hundred adults would be entirely free from restraints and interferences which are prejudicial to the *perfectly* natural expression of the sexual impulse. In some of them, no doubt, the interference would not be very marked according to our present standards of judgment. In others it would probably be serious. Changes occurring in the outside world, altered arrangements, new rules and regulations, would leave them unchanged unless and until inner freedom was secured.

Freedom from what? We saw in the last chapter how the refusal of the super-ego to grow up results in a tyranny which can play havoc with an individual's sexual expression. There, we were concerned primarily with interference which yields a homosexual result. But nearly all—perhaps all—sexual difficulties, excluding those which arise from purely physical causes (not a large proportion) are attributable to this dark dictator who sits enthroned deep within our minds. It is important to understand how this dictatorship secures and maintains its power over us.

If we are to attain genuine sexual freedom we have to control this dictatorship, thus breaking its power over us, and making it serve our highest good. That cannot be achieved quickly. To achieve it is the aim of sex re-education.

I find that many people who have heard an explanation of the problem of inner sexual freedom, along the lines of the foregoing, assume that the "dictator" is conscience. I have, indeed, been asked during questions following

a lecture whether people who lived for a period in a state where "free love" was regarded as permissible and even desirable, would not soon become accustomed to the idea, and, aided by propaganda, and still more by the fact that the new sex order was generally accepted, would easily adapt themselves to a state of affairs which, earlier, might have been repugnant to them.

Undoubtedly, many would. They would be people whose conscience had, hitherto, barred them from adventures outside of marriage. But conscience and super-ego are not one and the same.

Conscience might briefly be described, in a rough-and-ready manner as acceptance of the rules of the game—any game, including the very serious game of life. It begins to develop when, in childhood, we discover that if we are to secure the help and even praise of our parents, we must conform to the rules which they make. Later when we go to school, join groups or societies, indulge in sports or take part in politics, we find certain rules, not all of them written down, by which we must abide if we would retain the respect of our fellows. In many of these activities the rules which count for most are not set down in print; they are the traditional or established codes of what is, or what is not, done. From an early age we may have been under the influence of religion, which again has impressed upon us certain rules, from the Ten Commandments of the Old Testament to the "Marching Orders of the Followers of Christ," the unsurpassed principles laid down in The Sermon on the Mount.

Conscience begins, then, in infancy, when it reflects the wishes of our parents. Later in life, particularly if we have been "well-educated" in the truest sense, it reflects the claims of the community. Thus when we follow a purely selfish policy without regard to the well-being of others, a measure of conflict—how marked depends upon the strength of the conscience—occurs. It is a conflict between our selfish self and the better self which has been created by training and various ennobling influences—or, more accurately, two parts of our self are at war, and we can feel the struggle within us.

Conscience, as the term is ordinarily employed, is something of which we are all conscious. The tyrant which exercises dictatorial powers over our sexual expression resides in the unconscious. All of us are aware of much that goes on in our minds. We deliberately, and therefore consciously, plan to learn a language, decide which text books we will buy, or to whom we will go for lessons. Once we have acquired fluency, however, we find ourselves uttering words and whole sentences automatically, with no thought being given to the forming of the sentences or the pronunciation of the words, the mind being occupied entirely with the ideas which we wished to convey. Thus we do some things consciously and others unconsciously. Some of the things we do unconsciously—certain tendencies we display and certain gestures we use—are noted by others, though we may be totally unaware of them.

While we do not deliberately plan each step when we walk or run, while, therefore, these are automatic actions which result from brain processes which are performed outside of our conscious, deliberate choice, we are, nevertheless, aware that we do walk or run. Most people would say that we walk or run "unconsciously," for, in its popular usage, the unconscious simply describes those emotional or mental processes, and the actions arising from them, which are within the grasp of our consciousness although, for some reason or other, we may not at any given time be aware of them.

Thus, if a friend draws your attention to the fact that you usually rub your left ear with the forefinger of your left hand whenever you are considering a perplexing question, you may be surprised. You have been "unconscious" of that particular habit. Yet it has not been outside the grasp of your consciousness. The whole thing is very simple, your attention has been directed to something which had continued for a long time without you being aware of it.

There is, however, a deeper "unconsciousness" which is a very important part of our minds. Even when we have had our attention drawn to it, by reading, or possibly through listening to a lecture on the subject, it is only on rare occasions that we find in our own direct experience examples of its workings. Occasionally we may feel that a certain course of action is desirable. It seems perfectly sound, and, moreover, conscience approves. Indeed, conscience may be largely responsible for our interest in the course of action under consideration.

For some reason which we cannot explain, we keep deferring action. Conscience becomes troubled about the delay; we find ourselves saying: "I really must do this thing immediately," for we feel we *ought* to do it. Yet, although we are beginning to feel guilty at not having acted, something still holds us back. There is a lurking feeling containing a hint of danger in the proposed move, and also a certain suggestion of guilt about it. There we have an inkling—hardly more—of the strange manner in which a sort of censor operates in the deep recesses of the mind and cries "Stop!" even when we are quite certain that what we have in mind is a sound and desirable course of action, one not only approved by conscience but, indeed, encouraged by it.

Whether or not this censor can be regarded as a sort of super-conscience, whether it should be regarded as part of conscience, I am not prepared to discuss. If we regard it thus, then we have to face the fact that conscience is often divided. Good people, anxious to do the right thing, are often troubled by what appears to be a conflict in the conscience. It may well be that the explanation lies in this warring between the conscience, as we normally understand it, and the censor in the unconscious recesses of the mind.

Be that as it may, I think that we shall usually find the explanation in those early experiences which have been—to use a colloquialism which aids our explanation—"fed into" the unconsciousness from our earliest days. Conscience may urge you to devote a large part of your time and much of your money to some form of social service. You think it out; your own future is amply provided for, there are no relations for whom you need to make provision, you can well afford to serve others less fortunately situated than yourself. What holds you back? It may be a certain *unconscious* sense of class loyalty, linked with ideas of class superiority, extreme caution, a self-preservative sense, and so on—all of them derived from ideas and feelings which have been part of the very life of your family and your ancestors for many years.

Inevitably, when much the same process occurs in connection with sex, the effect is often very profound. It may, and often does, take forms which are exceedingly difficult to understand. I have said that from our earliest days various thoughts and ideas are "fed into" the unconscious. Let us consider one way in which this is done.

As the child becomes interested in his surroundings, he soon discovers that if he is to find life tolerably pleasant, he must live at peace with the wider community—in his case, the family. Since father and mother jointly preside

over the family, the child is particularly anxious to secure their approval. He may be at loggerheads with sisters and brothers, but the approval of father and mother—particularly mother, since she is so closely concerned with his welfare and comfort—are very necessary to him.

Like the rest of us, the child occasionally fails to respond in a proper and positive manner to his environment; he does those things of which his parents disapprove, and which he knows will not increase his popularity with them! He soon finds that markedly recalcitrant behaviour does not pay. Open defiance of the adults in his family proves to be an unwise policy; they are too powerful, and anyway, he needs their love and approval. So he adopts various stratagems and makes excuses to account for any little lapses.

Just as we adults find ourselves involved in conflict whenever we act in a manner prejudicial to the claims of the community of which we form a part, so with the child. He suffers his conflicts, and he makes excuses for what, in his heart, he feels is not quite in accordance with the standards he ought to live up to. He refuses to accept responsibility for the "worst part" of his make-up; any inclinations or desires which seem to him to be positively evil he "puts out of mind" and he tries to act for all the world as though they were not there. But every thought, every inclination, all that reaches us through any of our senses is stored in the unconscious. Those desires which we have felt but have "put away" as unworthy, are not altogether lost. If they have been put away gently in a conscious, deliberate manner, after a quiet choice of what appears to be the right course, their influence may not be very great. But, as we have seen elsewhere in this book, if they are forced back into the unconscious to an accompaniment of shock, fear, and shame, then they may prove very troublesome.

During the first five years of life, the child usually passes through three phases which are characterised by the predominance of certain activities. First, there is the *Oral Phase* in which two activities are very marked, those of incorporation, in the form of swallowing and sucking, and of destruction, in the form of biting and devouring. Then follows the *Anal Phase*, marked by putting away on the one hand, and retaining on the other—expelling faeces, retaining faeces. The *Genital Phase* follows, with touching and exhibiting, or curiosity and revelation as the characteristics.

During that period of five years the impressionable mind of the child takes in a great deal; but inevitably, for the reasons indicated above, much is also discovered or felt only to be "put away." It is very desirable that the "putting away" should be gentle and deliberate, based upon consideration following wise, loving parental guidance, instead of a throwing into the unconsciousness of thoughts and impressions which are accompanied by fear and shame, and by memories of pain and punishment which, although only vaguely remembered, and after a time not remembered at all, remain in the deeper recesses of the mind to wreak havoc, possibly throughout life.

It is during those first five years that we learn much of what we may do and may not do. As the years pass we find loyalties other than those of the family claiming our allegiance, and all the time our desires conflict with the pattern to which we must conform if we are to attain the group's approval, society's approval. The restrictive influences which really operate are not the outward rules and regulations, but the effect they have upon us. And at any given moment we ourselves reflect, in our mental and emotional make-up, not

so much the community around us, as a long list of earlier communities. The voice of a transformed society may cry out that it is right for us to do this or that; but deep within us there is another Voice which speaks for a hundred other voices—those of our parents and our grandparents, our teachers and guardians, the writers of all the books we have ever read, and of all the plays and films we have seen, the broadcasters to whom we have listened, the friends we have admired and the enemies we have feared. All these, and a thousand other influences speak as one in the Voice which criticises and threatens us.

It is this Voice which prevents so many actions which, otherwise, we should take, a Voice which speaks for a hidden guiltiness which has no reality basis, but is really rooted in childish fantasies. Right from earliest childhood we have been seeking the approval of others—father, mother, teacher, clergyman, employer, and so on—and, in order to gain it, and also to guard ourselves against a wide range of dangers—loss of parental love, being regarded as an “outsider” by our fellows—we pay the price of an ever-increasing store of inhibitions.

So long as we are under the domination of this Voice, which tells us what to do and what not to do, and always speaks with threats, implied if not, plainly uttered, we cannot airily talk of sexual freedom as though changes in society would yield benefit without revealing our own essential weakness, our slavery to the inner dictatorship. It is not within our power suddenly to sweep away this Voice, with its darkly threatening combination of unconscious impulses.

But although we cannot determine suddenly to banish this dictator, and carry out our resolution, it is a considerable gain to be aware of the manner in which it has secured its power over us. This knowledge enables us to embark upon a corrective process designed to guide, control, and re-educate the super-ego, a process which, as we can now see, is likely to take much time to complete, since the influences which have been “fed” into the unconscious “storehouse” are the influences not merely of a lifetime, but of many centuries.

This knowledge also is valuable to us because it reveals just how important is sex re-education, and how necessary it is that this lengthy task should be embarked upon without delay. Perhaps it appears discouraging that complete re-education should inevitably be such a lengthy process; but, of course, here we are dealing with something which goes right to the very roots of our behaviour. If the task is big, the rewards also are big. Indeed, the task is nothing less than human reconstruction; and the prize, genuinely free men and women.

The super-ego can be our friend instead of our enemy; that is the point. The voice which speaks from the deepest recesses of the unconscious, often forbidding that which is natural and right; which conspires against us with evidence founded on fantasies, and which often directs the sexual impulse to false objectives, must be taught to serve us, and not to hinder, bully, and alarm. Only the thorough, complete re-education of the super-ego can yield sexual freedom *within*—and that is where it is most needed.

Within the shelter of marriage there is ample opportunity for adequate sexual expression. Indeed, the fullest possible expression is to be had within marriage by those who understand the true nature of sex, and realise how essential it is that this basic impulse should be guided and controlled by love. The “free lovers” who pass from one experiment to another are the slaves of sex; the Voice bids them rebel against convention and rebel they *must*. In the

overwhelming majority of cases, those who rebel in that sphere are unable to accept rules and regulations and conventions in other spheres. Often they find it very hard to accept majority-rule, and they support movements with revolutionary aims to be attained by violence. They are rebels against marriage because they are rebels against the community. They are rebels against the community because they are slaves to "the Voice." Most "die-hards," whether of rebellion or reaction, are slaves of the inner dictator.

To-morrow, then, if the Archbishop were to spring a surprise on us and announce the Church's support of "free love," and press, B.B.C. and other agencies were to pour out their propaganda in support of the New Disorder, we, as individuals, would not be greatly affected—at the start, at any rate. For the voices of the wireless announcers, and the orators, even the voice of society itself, would be drowned by the Voice from within if our real, inner self were unprepared to accept the new dispensation.

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Only by learning more about ourselves, and by acting upon the knowledge gained, can we attain sexual freedom. And, when we become free within, we shall find rich opportunities for the expression of a genuinely free love within the bounds of a happy marriage.

CHAPTER XVI

SEX SUBLIMATION

To judge by the statements of many clergymen, and writers of the more "popular" works on sexual ethics, sublimation is the magic means of sweeping away at will all the less desirable forms of sexual expression. It would, of course, simplify matters a great deal if we could prescribe sublimation like a medicine, or order a course of sublimation in appropriate cases. But the strains and stresses which arise from so fundamental and strong an urge as the sex instinct cannot be resolved by any single panacea.

There are parents who inquire what course of action should be taken regarding their children "to ensure adequate sublimation." Adults sometimes say: "Well, I have run perilously near to danger; now I must practise sublimation and be on the safe side."

In one of the less lurid "real-life" stories related by Judge Lindsey in *Companionate Marriage*, an anonymous business man engages in a long conversation with the Judge. This man tells the Judge that he has sent his girl to a school which he picked with sublimation in mind. Having thus shown that he has no idea what sublimation really is, he becomes confused between sublimation and substitution when he adds: "Many people who think they have sublimated their sex impulses into something they call higher, have really translated them into perversions and disorders . . ."

Sublimation means that sexuality has found an outlet through some channel which is higher, something permissible, and socially desirable. It is substitution which yields what Judge Lindsey's business man calls "perversions"—more

properly deviations—such substitutes being inferior to normal sex expression, and on a lower level—something undesirable.

I want to make clear that sublimation is the normal and natural method of giving expression to instinctive energy; it is the means by which, without being conscious of it, we adapt ourselves adequately to the life around us, to society, to reality. But the whole process is unconscious, which, as I have stressed before, means beyond our conscious awareness. It is, therefore, absurd to say: "Now, I will practise sublimation." Sublimation is not of the will.

Nevertheless, the knowledge which we have gained of this process is valuable in that it reveals to us the importance of harmonious, all-round development through the living of a full and well-balanced life. Since we have learned that the sex instinct can find expression in works of literature and art, or in various forms of social service, we have an indication of the great importance of this instinct, not merely in regard to what we commonly call sex, but to total personality. We know that a sound sex adjustment is a valuable basis upon which the whole personality structure can rest. We know that, this being so, the fuller are our lives, the more likely we are to smooth out the stresses and strains of the basic sex impulse as it strives to secure an outlet. All this knowledge is helpful to us.

Thus the parent, who has enlightened his child about sex, may well explain—possibly when the child is in his early teens—that sex is the foundation of the whole personality structure, and that its mere physical expression is but a part of its value. But we have to avoid the mistake which is often made of assuming that the sex impulse can be entirely "worked off" through physical exertions, games and the like. As Havelock Ellis has said, it may be true that some people can readily put aside the stresses of sex, but for many, even with the best will in the world, this is not so. "Neither muscular exertion nor mental distraction here proves effective. The games in which schoolmasters seem to have faith do not arrest sexual activity, unless carried to an extreme and harmful degree. At school, it has been said, the best athletes are usually the most prominent rakes."

This last seems a rather extreme statement for such a usually-cautious commentator as Havelock Ellis to make, and it has often been questioned. Undoubtedly, he was writing from knowledge based on close observation, as in another of his works he says: "Healthy physical exercise, so far from repressing sexual desire, much more often, both in men and women, acts as a stimulant to evoke it."

Healthful recreations and exercises are of great value; but they do not necessarily yield sublimation. They provide the schoolboy with a valuable outlet for his pugnacity; they enable him to express his urge to self-assertion. They are beneficial physically. There might be a case in which a boy who feels an *instinctive* impulse to play games, and who throws himself into athletics with almost religious zeal, might quite unknowingly, be sublimating part of his sex urge through games. In the same way, a woman who sees her chances of marriage becoming dimmer, may feel instinctively drawn to child welfare work, and may take it up with enthusiasm, possibly achieving a measure of sublimation through such work. Dr. David Yellowlees, in a lecture to a conference of the Christian Student Movement, explained this by saying: "People do such things for their own sakes, because they find them interesting, not thinking about sublimation at all. The actual process of sublimation is

essentially unconscious. Here again, a lot of people go astray, forgetting that sublimation is not a matter of conscious effort. We cannot simply say: 'Dash it all, here is an instinct. I must go away and sublimate it.' The acceptance of the instinctive impulse, and the recognition of the need for an outlet, may be conscious, but the sublimation is unconscious; just as eating is conscious, but digestion unconscious—or else uncomfortable and inadequate!"

While there are many preachers and writers who seem to believe that sublimation can be effected at will, by the deliberate choice of some form of service or by concentration upon work, psychologists generally recognise that true sublimation is not easily achieved. Freud has pointed out that many people possess the capacity for sublimation only to a small degree. And he has also noted that sublimation cannot discharge more than a proportion of sexuality. Thus those who speak as though sublimation can be employed deliberately as a complete and effective substitute for other forms of sexual expression doubly err; they are wrong in supposing that sublimation is a process which can be set in motion by personal choice, and they are wrong in supposing that it can ever provide for the transmutation of the whole sex impulse.

Even so, what we know of sublimation encourages us to co-operate so far as we can with the deep, inner processes which we know take place in those who attain a sound balance between repression and expression. There are forms of service to humanity which are open to us all, while one great avenue of sublimation, and one which psychologists generally agree is the greatest, is religion. It should be observed that many psychologists who do not accept the tenets of any church or religious body nevertheless strongly hold this view. Indeed, some, realising that sublimation is exceedingly difficult of attainment, hold that religion in its wider sense is probably the sole means of true sublimation.

Dr. Kenneth Walker has written: "That true sublimation is a change that is comparatively seldom achieved is not the opinion of the writer only . . . Even when some amount of sublimation has been achieved, a portion of the sexual impulse is generally left to be disposed of. More often than not, in the non-religious man no sublimation has been achieved at all. The sexual urge flows inward, as in the case of the auto-erotic, is arrested at various levels in a number of fixations, or else finds new channels in neurotic transformations. A virtue based on a fine ideal is one thing, but a seeming virtue that is rooted in fear is another. Sublimation is a word that must be used with more discretion."

But while it is true that the possible avenues for sublimation, including religion, should enter into the consideration of those who would live the good life, with all the elements of the total personality working harmoniously together, and while it is true that such avenues should be borne in mind by parents who would help their children to attain inner freedom through the well-ordered life, a word of warning is necessary. It is dangerous to endeavour to force the pace. Just as some parents and schoolmasters overdo the emphasis on sports, so others, realising that religion is one avenue of sublimation, force religion down the throats of those who are not prepared for it—or, rather, do not find it the natural avenue of sublimation which it may be for others. It is possible that music or some other form of art may be for some what religion may be for others—the one thing towards which an *instinctive impulse* is felt. It is where this attraction is felt that sublimation may occur.

Doubtless all this is disappointing to those who plan grandiose schemes of a new world in which all men, women and children would be classified and docketed, possibly after intelligence tests, and where by means of games and other activities, provision would be made for a sort of massed sublimation. The totalitarian misuse of psychology is one of the dangers which may have to be faced in the hitherto free countries in the future. The more we learn of psychology, the more psychological research reveals the mysteries of our hidden selves to us, the more we discover the supreme importance of the individual, and the need for the individual to adjust himself to the community if he is to attain his highest good.

CHAPTER XVII

FAMILY FINANCE

"WANTED, a woman to work unlimited hours, and willing to perform some of her duties while on holiday. Must be good cook, capable children's nurse, efficient housekeeper, useful with her needle, and able to undertake a certain amount of interior decoration. Remuneration, nil."

"Cultured and attractive woman, of good social position, offered post demanding exceptional tact and the ability to control a large household staff. She must be capable of entertaining distinguished guests, of supervising household purchasing. Keep only offered."

We have heard a great deal in recent years about "truth in advertising." I sometimes think that if it were customary to advertise for wives we should learn a good deal of the truth about marriage as it exists to-day!

Every year, hundreds of thousands of advertisements along the lines of the first above would appear. The Trades Union Congress would probably send deputations to the Ministry of Labour to urge action to stop "domestic sweating."

Every year, several thousand advertisements somewhat similar to the second one would be published. The whole nation would soon be appalled at the heartlessness of "the Upper Ten."

You see, the advertisements would have to appear under the general heading "Wives Wanted!" For in these days of social legislation, factory laws, and humanitarian principles, only wives are expected to work unlimited hours without any guarantee whatever that they will receive one penny for themselves out of the family income.

So long as they are maintained, which means, fed, clothed and sheltered, they have no legal cause for complaint. *Yet if they were not wives, any one of the jobs which efficient wives do—child nursing, housekeeping, and the rest—would be worth a wage!*

As wives they have no fixed hours. There is no payment for overtime. Most wives have to perform some of their duties even when they are on holiday. Wives have practically no standing in the eyes of the law. They are

even listed in the census as "dependents" of their husbands, just as the children are!

Not long ago a woman who had saved a few pounds out of her house-keeping allowance, a shilling here, a shilling there, was sued by her husband for its return. Since she had been economical for years to scrape together the small sum involved, she justly felt it was hers. But the Court ordered her to repay her husband. That is the law. The Court had no alternative.

I am not going to suggest reforms designed to ensure that a wife shall be remunerated for her work. But I raise the whole subject here because I know from experience that the money side of marriage is of great importance, and of greater importance to free marriage. Almost any scheme for securing "wages for wives," or some definite proportion of the family income by law, proves impracticable. Individual circumstances vary so much that it is impossible to lay down any hard-and-fast rule as to how the family income should be apportioned.

Undoubtedly, the great need of the vast masses of people is higher wages. No matter how fairly the husband may try to arrange the financial side, in discussion with his wife, both come up against the one outstanding fact that whatever they decided to do proves inadequate, simply because the family income is too small. But it must be stressed that, to-day, there are far too many working-class wives who have to beg every penny they want for themselves, apart from the housekeeping costs. If they want to go to a lecture or "social" for which a charge is made, then they must "beg."

Among the wives of well-to-do husbands there are some—indeed, more than most people would believe—who *never* have any money which they can regard as their own, and which they can spend entirely as they please. They may dress well and have "the best of everything"—but all the bills are paid by their husbands. Such women sometimes cannot produce the price of a cup of tea! They may have to borrow small sums from their friends!

Marriage means the coming together of *two equals*. But there is no equality if one partner has to beg for every penny required for purely personal needs. Some modern couples try to organise their financial affairs along "fifty fifty" lines. This is not always possible. It is, of course, a particularly good plan when both partners are earners. All monies can then be placed into a joint account, from which household and other essential expenses are paid, and the balance shared equally.

Often when the husband is the sole earner, the income may be variable. Provision must be made for bad periods, future business expenses and the like. Probably in the majority of cases a fifty-fifty financial arrangement is out of the question. *But the spirit which underlies the idea should never be lost.* The right spirit will express itself in some reasonable and workable scheme, adapted to circumstances.

No matter how generous a husband may be, no matter how often and how freely he may give money to his wife, the benefit to her self-esteem and sense of freedom will not be nearly so great as it would be were he to allow her some sum, no matter how small, which would be hers *entirely*, and which she could spend exactly as she chose—unwisely, if she liked.

Needless to say, it is desirable that before marriage there should be an understanding about the apportionment of the income. Nowadays, many girls earn money before marriage. Nothing tends more to embitter them than that

they should have to ask their husbands for all the money they need. They soon feel that marriage—their marriage, at any rate—is much too one-sided. And, in fact, they are right.

What lies at the roots of so many disagreements regarding money is not the way the income is expended, or the absence of a fixed allocation for the wife's dress needs, but the feeling of injustice which so many wives experience. They see that their husbands are always able to entertain their friends, and always able to buy any little luxuries they may fancy—tobacco, for instance—while they, the wives, have no money to spend as they choose.

Few men have an adequate sense of gratitude for all that women have given them—as mothers, as sisters, as wives. I often marvel that we erect so many statues to explorers and military heroes whose services are deemed to have been valuable to the country or to humanity. Yet we have no great memorial to remind us of what we owe as individuals and as a nation to mothers and wives. Many of them are heroines of our everyday life. The working-class wife and mother usually is. She has to be!

So much ungrudging service entitles wives to more praise than they usually receive. Many a man, with no real ill-intention, never expresses gratitude for his wife's efforts on his behalf, while he may think nothing of making jokes at her expense. It is little points like this which count. We all like appreciation of our work. Wives are not exceptions to this rule. Wise husbands will always bear that in mind.

And now a word regarding the "breadwinner" business may not be out of place. There could be no greater mistake than to assume that because only the husband's name appears on a firm's pay-roll, he alone earns the family income. He has his wife behind him, ministering to his needs, ensuring that he sets out each day fit for work and well-prepared for all that the day may bring. He may "support" her financially, but she supports him in ways too numerous to mention, thus making it possible for him to carry on his work to the best advantage.

To ignore the immense contribution which the wife makes is as foolish as to deny the value of such an essential part of a modern army as the Supply Services. Behind each man in the firing-line, the experts assure us, there are at least fifteen other soldiers whose task it is to move up supplies, and generally to enable the front-line men to maintain their ability to fight. The wife may be likened to a combination of the Royal Army Service Corps and the Royal Army Medical Corps. She meets the husband's needs in both health and sickness. She provides the necessary "backing" to all his efforts.

Surely, then, it is not too much to ask that, if the family income permits it, some allowance—even though it may necessarily be small—should be made to the wife. Then, and only then, will she thoroughly enjoy what she has much more than earned.

I know that some ardent feminists have argued that wives should have "wages" by law. But what wages would be adequate for all that the average wife contributes to the home? How should we apportion the husband's and wife's share, of, say, three or four pounds a week? More, how could we decently place the wife in the position of permanent inferiority which the granting of a "wage" out of her husband's income would mean? For it would mean that just as soon as she had "wages" from her husband, he would become, in effect, the employer, and she the employed.

No, it is better to look upon marriage on its financial side, as, indeed, on all its sides, as a partnership. The duties may not be the same for each. But just as the husband will, in most cases, be at the head of the income-earning department, closely supported in many ways by his wife, she in turn will be at the head of the domestic side, closely supported by her husband.

To start marriage right on the money side is a big step towards ensuring married happiness. To show appreciation for all that the other partner does is even more vital. Many a business man who prides himself on the fine, friendly, human atmosphere in his office and works, whose own office is plastered with modern efficiency slogans, and whose praise is prompt and hearty for good work, fails dismally to apply the same methods in his own home. He takes his wife's services for granted, just as some wives fail to realise the strain which the task of making a living may impose upon a man in these days of keen competition.

"Friendship at its best" takes nothing for granted.

One way of classifying people is to divide them into those who manage money and those who are managed by money. Those who keep well on top of money have a valuable ally; for it works for them all the time. The others work for money all the time, and never get enough of it to meet their urgent requirements.

Some wives seem to think that their husbands can walk out into the garden and pick money off the trees. Some husbands never think of taking their wives into their confidence where money is concerned. They cannot believe that their wives may possess full-sized sets of brains. Yet, in spite of the extravagance of which women *can* be guilty, women as a whole can "out-economise" men any day. It pays to "go into partnership" on the financial side of home-running. And the basic idea must always be to ensure that, however small the family income may be, there will be a balance over after all expenses have been met.

Illness, holidays, "rainy days" all come, with or without Beveridge! Whether you take them in your stride or are completely put out by them depends upon whether you keep control of your money instead of being controlled by it. You must master money or be mastered by it. It can hold you in a grip which will make your life miserable. Thousands of marriages fail because the partners act like spoiled children where money is concerned. Each pound is a toy, nothing more—or the means of buying one.

One of the wealthiest men I ever met told me how one day he had listened to the conversation of two tired shopgirls who were awaiting the train home. "I wonder what it feels like to be rich!" one of them said. "I could have told them the truth," said the man of wealth, "but they would never have believed me. *I used to be rich before I made my money.* I used to have friends I trusted, real friends. Now, I have business associates, most of whom are interested in my trade-attracting powers, but certainly not in me as an individual. Wherever I go, whatever I do, business is on my mind. Believe me, it's as though I were a prisoner in a cage of gold."

He paused for a moment. Then he went on: "That sounds poetic, doesn't it? But it's the plain literal truth. I used to buy a week's genuine riches at a bookshop for an odd shilling. Time was when I'd have given anything to go to a theatre. Now, I go occasionally—and feel all the while that I'm wasting my time. Money is a big responsibility and it's rather got me down, I can tell

you. The trouble is that I've made myself into a money-making machine and I am quite unfitted for anything else."

He said one other thing which I recall. It may sound very obvious to some, and rather startlingly true and refreshing to others. He said: "Doctor, the plain truth is that the best things in life are FREE."

True enough. You do not—yet, anyway—have to pay anything to see the sunset. There is no charge for swinging your legs in the open country, breathing purer air than you can inhale in the best hotels. But simply because such things may be had for the taking, many do not appreciate them. They take them for granted, just as foolish husbands and wives take their partners for granted for no better reason than that they are always there, always to be depended upon.

If you feel that I am tending to exaggerate I can assure you that your opinion would change were you able to look at some of the very rich. Why, I know men who are wheeled around in Hyde Park in bathchairs and who gape with envy, yes, *envy*, when they see a strong navvy swinging a pickaxe or heartily enjoying a lunch of bread and cheese. Most people do not put an adequate value on such priceless assets as health unless they lose them. There are men who command millions in money who would give every penny of their fortunes if they could wake up to-morrow morning feeling really fit—both mentally and physically. Some of them would be fit to-day if they had remained poor, unable to buy the things which cost money, and compelled to find their enjoyments in the simple things which cost little or nothing.

I am not urging that the world would be a better place if people were poorer. My point is that health, a *sufficiency* of material things, friends, and such inward assets as a sense of humour and the power to appreciate the beauty which surrounds us *are riches*, and should be recognised as such.

I once entered a humble cottage in the West Country. On the walls were cheap reproductions of masterpieces of art. You could have bought them all for three or four pounds. Yet what joy had gone to the building up, bit by bit, of this little treasure-house! The man had simply bought the things which appealed to him. He made no pretence of knowing anything about art. The result was that his home expressed his own personality in an individual and pleasing manner. It was a joy to visit it. *His riches were in his mind.*

To a sound, adult outlook which gives to beauty its rightful place, add the willingness to *plan*. That is essential if you want to be rich whatever your income. Haphazard spending, false economy taking the form of ruthless cutting-down of expenditures, these all go when a plan is adhered to. The object must be to get the utmost value out of all money expended—twenty shilling'sworth of genuine value out of every pound. That is the way to make money work and to bring home the goods. It is also the only way to retain a balance, whatever your income. A credit balance means peace of mind. Debt means worry. That is why happy marriage demands an adult system of handling money.

You can often ascertain by their talk the people who fail to bring an orderly mind, with its inevitable planning, to the handling of money. The woman who laments that she "has not a thing to wear," in spite of a wardrobe full of clothes, is among them. The man who borrows a fiver the day after receiving his salary is another. Neither is fully fit for marriage.

On the other hand, the miser is as much a slave to money as the spendthrift. It is good to "let yourself go" occasionally. If your income is small, but you feel you would like an occasional cigar, by all means buy a box. But do not cripple yourself by overdoing this sort of thing. Nine men out of ten gain by permitting themselves a "millionaire luxury" from time to time. And there is hardly a woman breathing who will not react well emotionally and even physically to a new hat or a coveted gown. She feels better for it, and she is.

Once again, we find that the essential thing is *adapation*. A sound sense of values in all things; avoidance of extremes, even in the practice of such virtues as thrift and generosity; adaptation to one's circumstances—these help you to life's real riches.

CHAPTER XVIII

MARRIAGES OF CONVENIENCE

"It is better to marry the life you like, because after a while the man does not matter!"

Far be it from me to suggest that the partner can cease to matter in any satisfactory marriage. But it is important to marry the life you like. The cold, "calculating" approach to marriage may appear dreadful to many. But is it really so? Surely, if you have the background which you desire for your married life, you have secured one very important aid to married happiness.

Undoubtedly one reason why marriage bureaux prove so successful—and they all seem to become old-established businesses with hosts of clients!—is that they enable thousands of people to marry *the life they like*. Let us consider them first among the avenues through which people pass towards a marriage which includes the standard or type of life they desire.

Matrimonial Agencies

I am not concerned here with advocating or condemning matrimonial agencies. Obviously, everything depends upon the way in which they are conducted. But it is clear that, as things are, these agencies do meet the needs of a large number of people. And if we are to study marriage, we may as well see what these marriage-making agencies can contribute to our knowledge. They can explain much.

For instance, they can teach us something about *people in relation to marriage*. Why, we wonder, do people patronise these agencies when they might just as easily, and certainly far less expensively, arrange their own marriages as most people do? There are various reasons. Unquestionably, the principal one is the deep-rooted fear felt by many people of both sexes, that any conventional approach they might make to a member of the opposite sex might result in rejection.

They fear rejection intensely. To them it means a blow to their self-esteem from which they might never recover. They simply cannot face the risk of being "turned down."

To many this may seem strange. But bear in mind that thousands of women never recover from the shock of being "jilted." And, believe me, many a

so-called "confirmed bachelor" longs for the companionship of marriage, but fears rebuff, possibly following upon earlier failures. *Rather than run the risk of losing the battle for a suitable partner, many prefer not to fight at all.*

Some, however, find it easier to have their personal details—height, complexion, weight, income, interests, and so on—listed, docketed and filed, with a photograph, at a marriage broker's office, so that others who desire to marry can make an approach. This eliminates some of the uncertainty. And there is the added fact that all the broker's clients are "in the same boat," in that all equally desire to wed—a fact which helps many nervous individuals, and accounts for their preferring this means of obtaining a suitable introduction.

Most applicants whose descriptions and requirements appear in the journals which English marriage brokers issue have at least a fair income. No doubt part of the explanation lies in the fact that the fees involved are beyond the means of the poorer members of the community. Another part of the explanation lies in the desire of people with incomes to meet and marry others more or less similarly placed.

Generally, marriage brokers in Great Britain carry on their work unobtrusively. They insert only small, discreetly-worded advertisements in the newspapers, and themselves publish journals in which the qualifications, interests, and requirements of their clients are stated. Some of the advertising put out by marriage brokers in the United States is much less restrained.

I have no doubt that on the average marriages through the agency of a bureau proved *rather more satisfactory* than those arranged along the somewhat haphazard lines which most people regard as "natural."

The people who enlist the aid of the marriage broker feel a certain need, which he is often able to meet. It must not be assumed for one moment—as it often is—that marriages arranged in this way must be "loveless." Far from it. A very genuine and lasting love may develop between the partners. The conditions are favourable to love. Sharing the life they love, the partners soon realise that they owe it all to each other, and that loving the life includes loving the partner in marriage—a *fact which every shared activity tends to emphasise.*

The advisability of marrying into one's own social circle is generally realised. There are, it is true, examples of extremely happy marriages between people of different social levels, but these must be regarded as exceptions rather than the general rule. It is also desirable that there should be something like equality in the financial position of the partners. The marriage of a wealthy man to a penniless girl is not, perhaps, as things stand, so fraught with danger as the marriage of a wealthy woman to a man who has no income. But in either case there rarely is that degree of comradeship which is desirable. In marriage, as elsewhere, a certain measure of patronising almost invariably accompanies wealth bestowed on poverty.

The man who spoke of his *financee* probably expressed, inadvertently, exactly what was in his mind! Many feel safer if they are able to satisfy themselves, as the result of the preliminary inquiries they make through a marriage broker, that the financial and social positions of any who interest them are not inferior to their own. Thus they feel that, should an introduction lead to marriage, purely financial considerations will not be the bait!

The experiences of matrimonial agents provide, from rather an unexpected source, ample confirmation of much which psychologists have said, but which most people regard as exaggerated. The evident feeling of inferiority which causes many to seek a marriage broker's aid proves how widespread are nervousness and hesitancy in regard to love and marriage. The types sought in marriage through brokers reveal the same thing in more acute form.

But the main point to note from the experiences of matrimonial agents is this: that *all* types marry, that even the ugly find partners, and that the shyest of the shy, who fear to approach the opposite sex along ordinary lines, find others who are equally shy, yet who are eager to marry. Sometimes the most cultured and most charming of women are incurably shy, at any rate where anything concerned with love or marriage is involved. Many a man who, in most fields of activity, is confident and successful, simply cannot bring himself to propose to any woman.

Confidence, and the realisation that marriage is as much for you as for anybody else, is the great essential.

That cannot be stressed too strongly or too often.

Parent-Arranged Marriages

Another type of marriage which often yields good results is that in which the parents of the partners conduct most of the preliminary arrangements. Sometimes, in such cases, the parents take the place of the marriage broker for all practical purposes. Sometimes, unhappily, the parents go much farther than the brokers do and insist that their plans be carried out, contrary to the real wishes of one or both of the young people.

On the whole, there is much to be said in favour of the parents devoting a great deal of interest to a matter which, when all is said and done, closely affects the future well-being and happiness of their children. But everything depends upon the measure of diplomacy with which the somewhat delicate matter is handled. Young people have minds of their own, and are likely to resent interference in what seems, to them, to be something affecting themselves alone.

There are, of course, many marriages in which the parents have done much of the preliminary "arranging" without permitting the young people to become aware of the fact. Generally, the results are good. The parents are eager to ensure that their child will marry a person of good habits, who is tolerably well-placed financially, and suitable in other respects. But, of course, much depends upon the parents' own attitude to marriage and all that it entails. If all parents were soundly adjusted to sex and marriage, their experienced guidance would obviously be of the utmost value to their children. But as we have seen, it is possible for people of all ages to remain emotionally in the infants' class.

It is only those parents who have studied the subject thoroughly, and who are reasonably free from infantile traits in their own emotional make-up, who are likely to be sound guides to their children when the selection of a partner in marriage is under discussion.

Generally parents tend to concentrate on what I have termed the *background* of marriage—such matters as the family income, the kind of life which the partners will have to live, and their "compatibility," so far as this

can be judged by reference to the young people's temperaments and interests. Thus marriages which parents have had a hand in shaping are likely to be at least as successful as those of a more conventional character. The factors which count for most in ensuring that the marriage has a reasonable chance of success from the start invariably receive attention. Provided that the young people are left entirely free to make the final decision—just as the usually not-so-young people make the final decision in the broker-arranged marriage—the results are likely to be, on the whole, satisfactory.

The Jewish Marriage

Those unacquainted with modern Jewish life might be pardoned for assuming that Jewish family life must be extremely one-sided in the husband's favour. With Jews, as with others, tradition has left its mark; and with them, as with others, tradition sometimes tends to obscure the truth about present-day conditions. Traditionally, Jews regarded men as superior to women. So, for that matter, did almost everybody else! "A man is obliged to offer three benedictions daily: that He has made me an Israelite, that He has not made me a woman, that He has not made me a boor."

These sentences from the Talmud make rather painful reading in these enlightened times. But the Rev. Dr. A. Cohen, in *Everyman's Talmud*, assures us—and not without ample reason—that too much prominence has been given to them by hostile critics. He adds that in no way is woman regarded by Jews "as a being inferior to man." Indeed, the widely-experienced magistrate, Mr. Claud Mullins, has remarked: "Whatever be the tradition as to women's *theoretical* position in Jewish social life, the *fact* is that in her *practical treatment she is usually better off than is her Christian sister.*" The italics are mine.

The Chief Rabbi has said: "The Jew is ambitious. The men will not marry until they are independent. Both the Jewish young man and girl demand a certain irreducible minimum of decent living and comfort before marrying." From the time they begin to think about marriage they are encouraged to direct their attention in part to the *background* factors. To quote the Rev. Dr. A. Cohen again, "The Torah teaches the correct procedure: a man should first build a house, then plant a vineyard, and after that marry."

This traditional insistence upon adequate preparation for the material basis of marriage—home, income, and so on—is reflected in the great care with which Jews select their partners in marriage, and the very close interest which Jewish parents take in the material aspect of their children's marriages.

Jews, like Christians and others, may fall a victim to the romantic illusion. Infatuation may cause them to break with tradition. But this does not happen very often. Usually, the young Jewish man or girl who falls madly in love finds the desire to marry curbed as soon as the ill-equipment of the proposed partner is made evident.

While romance plays its part in life, the Jew is trained from his early days not to go in search of romance, but, rather, to find it while going about his hum-drum, but vitally necessary, day-to-day work. Even when his heart is most engaged his head retains its critical powers. This is all due to training, not in the sense of a formal curriculum, but of an attitude which he has

acquired from the atmosphere which has surrounded him from infancy onwards.

The Jews provide us with ample evidence that some of the worst effects of the romantic idealism which has caused so much harm can be overcome by education in its true sense. The responsibilities assumed on marriage, the need for thrift and self-help even from the earliest days when money comes into one's possession—these are stressed until they become part of the Jew's very make-up. They influence his attitude to marriage. They characterise his outlook towards his children and towards their marriages. And what is the result?

To quote Mr. Claud Mullins again: "All of us who have done social work among the Jews can see the result of this sound teaching in the comparative absence of reckless marriages. I, for one, find that my admiration is here for the Jew more than for the Christian. If this teaching had been incorporated, for instance, in our Unemployment Insurance Acts and in our Poor Law relief, our problems of to-day would be more easily solved . . . It is the common experience of most social workers that there is a smaller proportion of destitute children among Jews than among Christians of a similar economic standard. A teaching that combines sexual self-control with the virtues of thrift and providence must produce fewer domestic tragedies than one which, in effect, encourages reckless marriages and the equally reckless production of children."

Elsewhere in this book we have stressed the dangers of "falling in love." In this chapter we have considered, briefly, some approaches to marriage in which factors other than love have played a part, usually a most prominent part. Between the blind approach of those held in the throes of infatuation, and the cold, calculating approach of those who weigh only material advantages and disadvantages, there is a wide gulf. Between the two there is an approach, that of rational love, which is as near the ideal as we poor mortals can hope to attain.

Those who tread this avenue of approach may lose their hearts, but they keep their heads. They do not chase the will-o'-the-wisp Romance, but start to build a house—and find Love entering it; or seek to earn a worthy livelihood—and find Love sharing it. Just as the wise man knows that in order to be healthy he must observe the rules of health and create conditions in which his body can function efficiently and harmoniously, so with Love. *To create the conditions in which it is most likely to flourish is more than half the battle.*

CHAPTER XIX

THE BREAK-UP VALUE OF A MARRIAGE

"*If we can't get along well together, we'll get a divorce!*" Not once or twice but many times in recent years I have heard engaged or newly-married people say that. They always say it enthusiastically, as though the fact that they have noted a way of escape from marriage is an enormous help. But why?

I have never heard a business man, launching out on more ambitious lines, and eager to impress others with the soundness of his scheme, remark: "And note this: if my plan proves a failure, I shall go bankrupt!" Business

men invariably realise that the will to win is of vital importance to them. And it is precisely the same with marriage. To have an eye on the exit, right from the start, is about the poorest attitude one could adopt. It is a sign of surrender before the fight starts!

It does not help much to lay down hard and fast rules on the subject of divorce. Circumstances vary so much. But I am quite certain of this: that the number of people who find in divorce the gateway to happiness is very, very small. A Swiss magazine conducted a large-scale investigation into the question: Are divorcees happy? It was ascertained that one-third of all divorcees regretted having resorted to the Divorce Court.

A lawyer who had been engaged in divorce cases for more than thirty years said that in discussion with his clients he found that at least three out of five divorcees regretted that they had been divorced. That was in the United States. Are things different in Great Britain from what they are in Switzerland and America? I do not think so. So far as I am aware, detailed investigations have not been made here. But one London solicitor told me that fully half of the clients with whom he had discussed the matter said that if they had their chance again, they would not choose divorce.

Many kinds of people pass through our divorce courts. The kind and the cruel, the mean and the generous, the wealthy and the poor—all sorts and conditions of men, all sorts and conditions of women. Yet, from the psychological point of view, one type undoubtedly predominates. The emotionally immature represent an extremely large proportion.

Why is it that the emotionally immature tend to turn to the divorce court?

Because of its simplicity, the routine of getting unmarried appeals to people who lack the courage to fight for anything, even for married happiness. But when all the excitement is over, when friends cease to discuss the divorce, things usually take on a very different hue. I have noticed that very few—indeed, hardly any—divorcees are willing to speak frankly about their experiences. Generally, women will talk freely about their personal problems to a close friend or to a professional adviser who holds their confidence. But I have found that a certain almost uncanny reticence marks their attitude to divorce. Why?

I have often pondered the question. One day I put it to a woman who had spoken very frankly about her reactions to various important events in her life, yet who seemed to “dry up” immediately her divorce case came under review. She was an intelligent woman—indeed, a brilliant woman. “You talk very frankly about your life,” I said, “but one thing I can’t understand. Your divorce created quite a sensation both among the public and, still more, among your friends. Yet whenever you seem to be approaching it in conversation you turn away from the subject. You always appear to fight shy of it!”

She thought for quite a long time before answering. Then she said: “You know, I’ve realised for a long time that I avoid that particular subject. Why? I never minded saying that my marriage was a mistake. It was a tragic mistake. I was young when I married—a mere child. But I could not make that excuse regarding my divorce. No, I was an experienced woman of the world. I had a mind of my own. There was no loss of pride in saying that I was foolish in the selection of a husband. But what I have to admit, if I am to be absolutely honest with myself, is that I made a big mistake about divorce. There is real hurt in admitting that.”

The woman who said that was, as I have said, brilliant. She had created a name for herself in a field which hitherto had been regarded as a close male preserve. Here she was, just entering upon middle age, and just beginning to realise a number of—to her—staggering facts. What were they? Not merely that her divorce was a mistake. No, much more than that.

She was realising that for twenty years she had regarded her marriage as a tragic mistake, when in fact she had been suffering all the time from the romantic delusion—feeling that marriage should have meant the end of almost every ill, and the automatic start of a period of intense happiness, without any effort on her part. She had never tried to hide from her friends the fact that she thought she had been foolish in her choice of a husband, when all the time she had been labouring under the delusion that marriage ought to mean a perfect husband as part of the contract. Lacking such a perfect mate, she had felt cheated. Through the generous co-operation of that blameless, good, and very human man, she had obtained a divorce. And that sudden change had brought her back to earth. She had begun to see things as they really were and she had soon reached the conclusion that her divorce was the greatest mistake she had ever made.

Not all women possess her intellectual gifts. The romantic dream enthralles the clever and the dull. Time after time I have seen women put all the blame upon their husbands when marriage has failed to equal their hopes, and turn to divorce, expecting it to provide solace. But, instead, it has wounded their pride.

The divorced rarely like to admit that they have made a mistake. The woman mentioned above acknowledged that she had resisted admitting, even to herself, that her divorce had been “a big mistake.” The result is that, although as I have shown, such evidence as is available suggests that divorcees are rarely pleased with the results of their action, we can safely assume that no questionnaire circulated among the divorced will, in every case, be honestly answered. Divorced people, and especially women, usually go through life pretending that they did the best thing. I can definitely state that many who do this are beating their hearts out because they did not wait a little longer, try a little harder, seek anew to master the technique of living in close communion with another.

Following divorce, there is usually a time spent in loneliness. It is a period during which a good deal of hard thinking invariably takes place. Only those who have to start living alone after having been half a couple know what a difference it makes! Sometimes they would give almost anything to have someone at hand with whom they could quarrel! Most people, however, are deceived by the camouflage of cheerfulness with which so many divorced women face the world. The truth is that divorce is not something to be sought lightly, as it is far too often to-day. It should be a last desperate expedient when all else has failed.

It is an old question: Which sex is more responsible for divorces? It can easily be answered. They are about equally responsible. The numbers of men or women who count as the “guilty” parties does not affect the issue. “Misconduct” is very rarely the *real* grounds for divorce. It may provide an excuse for it. It constitutes the legal grounds required. Beyond that, it hardly affects the position. The real causes go much deeper.

"Misconduct" is the result, or an "off-shoot," of other factors which, in the overwhelming majority of cases, are connected with ill-adjustment to marriage. Not, be it noted, as is so often assumed, of ill-adjustment of one party to the other, but from ill-adjustment to marriage itself. In other words, one or both of the partners are not really fit to marry because they are not free from those infantile traits to which we referred earlier.

What very few people appear to realise is this: that a man who has been divorced is unlikely to make a good husband to anybody. That statement, I know, is calculated to arouse a tremendous amount of disagreement, even of resentment. But it is absolutely true. There are exceptions, of course. But as a general rule it is true of marriage, as it is of other activities, that one failure is not a portent of future success, but rather of possible further failures.

I do not say that it is impossible for the divorcee to learn adaptation to marriage. I do not say that every person whose marriage has ended in divorce is necessarily, for the remainder of life, a failure in that part of human relations which concerns marriage. But in general it is undeniable that the divorcees *are* failures in the marriage field. *They have declared themselves to be failures.* They have given up the struggle. They have thrown in the sponge.

The reason why they often strongly resent any suggestion that the failure is theirs, and not something to be laid at the door of "marriage" as a responsible entity apart from themselves, is that deep down within themselves they are conscious of their failure. So conscious of this are they, indeed, that their sense of failure often makes them feel unfitted for further marital attempts. In the majority of cases, save only where some extreme brutality or abnormality of one of the partners provides an explanation, they wish that they had tried harder to make their marriage a success.

Here is another point worth bearing in mind. Very rarely indeed can it be truly said that an unhappy marriage is due entirely to one or the other of the parties. One may sue for divorce. But generally it takes two to "make" a divorce, right from the start. This may be hotly disputed by the know-alls who like to indicate which of the parties is really responsible. But the truth is that two persons, not one, "cannot make a go of it," as it is sometimes put. Two persons, not one, cannot adjust themselves to an intimate life together. Two persons cannot adjust themselves to marriage.

If they can do so, then a single act of misconduct is very unlikely to wreck the marriage except in cases where extreme views on the subject are held. Even where extreme religious views are held, there usually is a very marked distaste for divorce. It is when things go wrong, when some crisis occurs, that the capacity of the partners to adjust themselves to the married state, which really means to each other, is challenged anew. Sensible people face up to the fresh problem, with all its unpleasantness and difficulty. They adopt a constructive attitude. They weigh advantages and disadvantages in an adult manner. This kind of stock-taking, this valuation of the assets and the liabilities, generally reveals one thing conclusively that to forgive one breach of the marriage rules is better than to wreck the whole marriage.

It is never easy to pocket pride. It is almost impossible for the emotional babies to pocket their false pride. But in the majority of cases it pays to do so when the continuance of a marriage is at stake. Tolerance is one of the qualities of maturity; in mature love its place is near the top. If you love a child you show tolerance in a hundred ways towards his weaknesses, even towards

his misdeeds. Tolerance is one of the marks of parental love. It is also one of the marks of married love. Indeed, it is one of the strongest indications of the presence of genuine love. Mature love yields tolerance where infatuation yields only jealousy.

"Look before you leap!" is sound advice to all who contemplate divorce. Those who lack the capacity to live happily inside the institution of matrimony are not likely to find that a mere change of partners will make much difference. If you are incapable of mature love, then you are not fit for marriage—*any* marriage, to anybody.

Looking before leaping should enable you to see a number of things. First, what are the real values of your marriage? Are there no assets? If you immediately answer, "None at all," you are almost certainly incapable, for the time being, at any rate, of seeing things squarely. You are blinded by jealousy, or by infatuation for somebody else, or in some other respect you are prevented from being able to value the assets properly. You can, of course, seek the services of a valuer—possibly a psychologist. He may be able to show you how a better adaptation to the problems of marriage would yield an improvement. But if you told him that there was nothing the least bit good in your marriage, he would know at once that you were unable to weigh advantages and disadvantages properly, for some reason or other. There probably never has been a marriage, just as there never has been a person, without some good tucked away somewhere!

That is the trouble. So often it is tucked away and has to be sought out. If we expect the good things to come to us, without any effort on our part, we are bound to be disappointed. It is curious how we all tend to look back over our past lives and see how much better we might have handled various situations than we did at the time. Divorcees usually devote a good deal of reflection to the way in which they might handle their partners differently, if only they had their chance all over again. *After* divorce, they look back at their marriage in a much more detached manner than was possible before. Well, my advice is, use the looking which precedes the leaping for trying to do just that—surveying your marriage as it really is. Rigidly exclude all the idealistic impressions with which you began your marriage. Just look at it in a matter-of-fact way and weigh the value of the assets and of the liabilities.

Begin with the purely material aspect. How do you stand in relation to the creature comforts of life? Does your marriage provide them? Starting at this low level, work up through the others—security, companionship, and so on. Be absolutely honest with yourself. If at the end of such a valuation, carried out calmly and objectively, you do not find a credit balance only, then by all means stop looking and leap. But you have been warned! Nine out of ten divorcees only see the credit balance when it is too late. They want to draw on it when it is no longer available to them.

Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. A constant balancing of the account is part of the price to be paid for free marriage. The primary object is to ascertain not whether one is securing from the marriage all that one should, but whether the partnership is flourishing.

One thing married lovers ought always to keep well in mind. The methods which enable people to get along well with others generally are equally, nay more, important in marriage than elsewhere. For instance, everybody is the better for encouragement. We know that in business: we often tend to forget

its application to the love relationship. But one of the most effective ways of bringing out the good which is hidden beneath the surface, lies in the ungrudging giving of warm, honest appreciation and encouragement. We are indeed in a bad way if we cannot do our best without constant praise. But we have to realise that nearly everybody feels the need for appreciation. Give it a chance before you discuss divorce!

Honest appreciation! Note both words. The one is useless without the other. People, hastening to dig their marital graves, justify the most biting, hurtful criticisms on the grounds that they are honest. The flattery which is dishonest is seen through, and so fails in its object. But honest appreciation rings true. Almost every marriage provides countless opportunities for honest appreciation. They should be used.

This advice is not intended to apply only to the so-called trifles, the many little activities and services which play so large a part in almost every marriage. They are important. They ought to evoke something better than a grunt of approval! But there are other applications of this advice which should not be overlooked. For instance, some people who experience difficulties in the more intimate relationships of marriage would find that their trouble would disappear immediately if only their partners would utter a word of encouragement or of appreciation. Believe it or not, that statement is absolutely true.

The silent performance of what may have become almost a routine, as the supreme act of love on its physical side does become for many married people, can be transformed into something totally different just as soon as one partner makes it unmistakably clear that the other's efforts to create and maintain mutual joy are appreciated. There are some men whose powers to achieve satisfactory results in the more intimate embraces of marriage are greatly reduced, if not entirely lost, because of their feeling either that their efforts are distasteful to their wives, or that at best they are accepted merely as part of a necessary routine.

This, of course, is a sphere in which appreciation can be displayed in forms other than mere words. Responses of various kinds will tell their own story. Even so, it is as well to speak words when they can make so great a difference. A word to the wives is sufficient!

There are many wives, too, who have the same reaction to the physical side of the love-relationship. They feel that they are taken for granted. No word is said which would show that they are giving joy to their husbands. The longer such words of appreciation are delayed, the harder they will be to speak.

It is essential, then, if we are to be fair to ourselves and to our partners in marriage, that before we contemplate divorce we should ponder long and often, whether we are doing all that we can to ensure the success of our marriage. The free marriage is not a marriage rigidly bound by law, something which must on no account be broken up no matter at what cost in emotional and mental strain to the partners. There must be the way out, divorce, available for those who really need it. But the emotionally free who alone are fit for marriage will inevitably regard divorce as a last resort—not as a convenient exit, the precise position of which they must keep noting at every stage.

CHAPTER XX

PREPARING THE CHILD FOR FREE MARRIAGE

WE have seen what dangers must be faced, even in these enlightened times, by any who seek to provide easily-understood guidance for adults in the realm of sex. *Yet at the very time the case concerning "Love Without Fear" was engaging the attention of the Central Criminal Court, educationists and Board of Education officials were studying ways and means of promoting sex education in our schools.*

There was widespread recognition in educational and official circles that sex guidance and education was absolutely essential; youth group leaders, school teachers, Board of Education officials—all reported that lack of knowledge regarding sex, and—much worse—false attitudes towards sex, were not merely common, but *almost* general. War conditions, resulting in the separation of children from their parents, brought to a head a problem which for years had been crying out for attention.

Towards the end of 1943 a remarkable step forward was taken. The Board of Education issued its Educational Pamphlet No. 119 entitled *Sex Education in Schools and Youth Organisations*. This concluded: "The Board are concerned to offer an assurance of their warm support and encouragement to all those in schools, youth organisations, and training colleges, and to local education authorities, who are giving serious attention to this subject, and to affirm their belief that their initiative, based on broad educational considerations, but strengthened also by a desire to protect young people in these unsettled times, has a wide measure of approval and support."

Prior to the issue of this pamphlet, teachers who sought to provide sex education had to face many difficulties. They were by no means certain that their efforts would receive official endorsement. While the overwhelming majority of the parents was not only willing that their children should receive sex instruction, but delighted with the results, there was always the possibility that one or two parents would create difficulties. The subject of sex is charged with emotional gunpowder; one trifling error of judgment, one false move—even if more apparent than real—might cause a local sensation, accompanied by spirited protests to the local council from many quarters.

Therefore, we owe the highest praise to those pioneers of sex education in our schools who paved the way for the official recognition of the importance of this work. As the Board of Education pamphlet put it: "It is appropriate to offer encouragement to those who, with patience and often with courage, have made a valuable contribution to the furtherance of education in this subject."

Ideally, sex education ought not to be necessary in our schools. Sex is so much a part of all our lives, that there should be no need to arrange for special instruction regarding it, any more than for courses in breathing, eating, and so on. All these things claim attention at times, but usually in connection with other subjects. It is the same with sex. On no account should it be treated as a separate subject—like algebra, arithmetic, or geography. It must be worked

into the general educational scheme, through biology lessons, and in other ways as circumstances arise. The idea that there is something very extraordinary about sex, that it is something to be mentioned, if mentioned it must be, with bated breath, has got to be banished. But this will not be easy. It will take time.

At first consideration it may seem a minor point whether sex should be a separate subject or made into an integral part of the school routine. Actually it is a matter of supreme importance. Sex should not be something which has to be "learned." Neither can it be separated from personality as a whole. It is something which is perfectly natural, part of our make-up; its effects, the emotions which spring from it, the influence which it exercises over all we do are part of our life as a whole. That is why sex education is something much bigger than mere sex instruction. The former is exceedingly difficult. The latter is simple. The former is a long, continuing process. The latter consists merely of imparting information which could be obtained from books. The one is a part of *life itself*; the other, *knowledge*.

The child who has the good fortune to be born into a family where the parents genuinely love each other, and where all the various activities of the family life are inspired and guided by love, where kindness and courtesy rule, and where there is freedom from the fears and embarrassment so often connected with sex, will, by the time he starts going to school, have received a liberal sex education. His attitude towards sex will be natural and healthy. No amount of class-room instruction, however well devised and carried out, can possibly yield such good results as the happy home with its enormous moulding-power for good.

But this does not mean that we are faced with the question of home versus school where sex education is concerned. So many parents either do not assist their children in sex matters, or do so very clumsily, that the need for school guidance is great. But whatever steps are taken to promote sex education in the schools, the best results will still depend upon the co-operation of teacher and parent. Each can ease the other's task.

Sex education begins at home—in infancy. Even during the earliest days of childhood there are various bodily activities which closely resemble the sexual activities of adult years. Children display signs of interest in bodily and sexual matters soon after birth. They miss few opportunities of comparing their own bodies with those of their brothers, sisters, or playmates. This curiosity, this eagerness to learn, is of course desirable; it is *the real beginning of true education*. It must not be mistaken for something "nasty."

Children two or three years of age often seek to carry their investigations into the adult world. They try to obtain opportunities to observe their parents' naked bodies or to witness the exercise of bodily functions. Later, they are eager to learn what happens between their parents; the intimacies of the bedroom interest them, and they listen to any noises which come from the parents' room, or to other indications which might help them to solve the mystery of the adult world. Contrary to a widespread impression, then, sexual life does not really begin at puberty. To a degree, it exists from the start. It was, indeed, one of the most important discoveries of psycho-analysis that in this sense the youngest child had a sex-life.

The use of the term "sexual" in connection with various infantile activities and interests sometimes has occasioned anxiety among parents. This is due to

a misunderstanding. It is true that the infant's physical pleasures are partly sexual; but they are what Ernest Jones defined as "initial pleasures" as distinct from "end pleasures." Those physical manifestations which occur before puberty may, broadly, be regarded as initial pleasures. Those which take place after puberty may be considered as end pleasures.

The initial pleasures often exercise a considerable influence on later sexual expression. Various thoughts which pass through the infant mind have their origin in the child's sex nature, though they are not likely to be recognised by the child as having anything to do with sex. They are important in that they represent the beginning of an attitude, or a number of attitudes, towards father and mother, sister and brother, and towards others—attitudes which may be modified or intensified by subsequent experience, but which inevitably leave their mark on the emotional make-up.

Sex education of a kind begins, then, in infancy—at home. The baby's first need is for love, and for the many services which are lovingly rendered by his mother. The mother invariably displays signs of affection when performing these services, with the result that the service itself, and the love which inspires it, are regarded as one by the child. Washing and caressing; putting to bed and kisses; clothing or undressing, and words of endearment—the service and the love are one. And this is as it should be. The child needs love at least as much as it requires careful attention to his general requirements—a point which was forcibly brought home when, during the war, many thousands of children were evacuated from our towns in the danger-areas, without their mothers.

No matter how well children are cared for in other respects, if they lack this love, they usually suffer. Illness or even death may result from the sudden withdrawal of the love which is as vital to them as food or clothing. The child without a mother's love invariably is a victim of emotional starvation, though some become more stunted emotionally than do others. And the child inevitably responds to the mother's love in its many manifestations.

Various pleasurable sensations experienced in connection with the services mentioned play an important part in the child's emotional development. Some parts of the child's body are peculiarly sensitive (as are some parts of the adult body) to touches and caresses, and consequently side by side with the satisfaction of bodily needs there are often pleasurable sensations. Sometimes, however, unpleasant or even painful sensations are suffered. But where the feelings are pleasurable, with consequent desire on the child's part for them to be repeated, they are usually called forth by the mother—the one who attends to the child's needs. Is it surprising that, with little boys and girls, the mother becomes the primary love object?

It is when the child's need of his mother is most marked, during the very earliest years, that mental attitudes are formed. The child may never have heard the word "sex" mentioned, and even if he did, the word would convey no meaning. Nevertheless, his attitude towards sex is formed just at this time.

The child's sexual activities prior to puberty, or very near to puberty, are sometimes described as being "non-genital." They are not linked in any way with the idea of physical union with someone outside of the family, but take the form of a search for pleasurable sensations, as we have seen, and of the satisfaction of curiosity. These efforts to secure the repetition of pleasurable sensations are perfectly natural; attempts to discover the truth about men

and women and children, how they are made and what they do, are *an essential part of a child's emotional and intellectual development*.

It is important that we should recognise this and realise that the very fact that young children *do* seek information regarding the "facts of life" provides us with opportunities to aid the child by informing it of the truth freely and frankly, when the need arises, and to guide him in such a way as to ensure normality of development. These splendid opportunities to help the child arise constantly. But often—far too often—parents ignore them. Worse still—very much worse—the child is sometimes firmly discouraged from displaying any interest in such matters. Indeed, his natural and perfectly healthy curiosity may be crushed. He may even be told that he is a nasty, unpleasant little thing to inquire about such matters! In his childish way he must marvel at being told that he is nasty and unpleasant for being interested in what is, after all, very much his own business! The crushing of the child's natural curiosity often—indeed usually—yields harmful results, though of course the actual degree of harm will vary greatly in different cases, and may be fully revealed only in the course of a lifetime.

It cannot be stressed too strongly that the child's curiosity must be satisfied along sound lines if healthy, normal development is to be ensured. How this may best be done we will not discuss here; that will come in a later chapter. But sufficient has been said to emphasise that sex *education*, in the true sense of the term, must inevitably begin in the home, and during infancy.

Now we shall do well to realise, at this stage, that we are all, to a greater or lesser degree, victims of the past. Doubtless, in many respects we have profited much from the past; I am one of those who believe that the tendency nowadays is to under-estimate what we all owe to those who have gone before us. But we also suffer from the false attitude towards sex which has persisted for centuries. However strongly we feel that we have "emancipated" ourselves from the old, discredited ideas, however freely we may now discuss things which formerly were banned by the conspiracy of silence, the fact remains that we are not entirely free from their influence. Do what we will to mend matters for ourselves and for others, it may well take us one hundred years or more to become entirely free from the ill effects of the old outlook.

In one sense, then, it is true to say that there is no one ideally fitted to undertake the sex education of the young, since not one of us is entirely free within. Many whose qualifications render them ideally suitable in most respects as sex educators, cannot possibly undertake the work because they are unable to discuss sex in a natural, friendly manner. They become either irritated or confused so soon as the subject crops up. Many teachers, really good teachers, realise their weakness in this respect. They can impart information well. They know how to hold the attention of a class or of an individual. But they cannot discuss sex without feeling extremely awkward, blushing, or in some other way indicating that here is a subject which they would very much rather not discuss.

One reason why it is necessary to treat sex as an integral part of the general work of the school, instead of as a separate school subject, is that on no account must the child be made to feel that here is something unusual, something which cannot be discussed as easily and naturally as, say, eating and drinking, breathing, or any other perfectly natural activity. If teachers reveal, by their own awkwardness or confusion, that they would very much prefer

not to have to talk about the subject at all, the children immediately notice the changed atmosphere. They are extremely quick to notice such things!

Sex education in our schools is, therefore, not so much a matter of imparting the right information, as of conveying it in the right way. Good sex education in the schools is dependent upon there being available a sufficient number of teachers who, besides being qualified in other respects to handle the subject, are *themselves* reasonably free from inhibitions regarding sex.

I have said the *we ought* to be able to discuss sex as easily as we talk about eating and drinking; but we are a long way from the stage when this will be possible in our schools. For one thing, the children are not fresh virgin ground upon which the sex educator can work. On the contrary, they have formed many impressions about what are really sex matters, long before they go to school. Some have acquired a healthy, sound outlook. At present this group is a minority. Most of them have acquired the feeling that anything to do with sex and its organs is unmentionable, at least, outside the family circle, even if it is permissible there. Varying degrees of development in this sphere are inevitable, with some of the brightest pupils possibly among the most backward in this particular respect.

These difficulties are recognised by the Board of Education and by the teachers themselves. It has been my privilege to lecture to groups of teachers in connection with the effort to promote sex education in the schools, and I have found that there is, invariably, not only an understanding of the difficulties involved, but a deep-rooted desire to overcome them. Teachers generally are well aware that, as things are at present (which means as *we* are at present, in this case), sex is full of emotional gunpowder, and therefore needs very careful handling. And that recognition may, sometimes, result in very good teachers holding back and feeling that they are not suitable for such work, when, in fact, they could adjust themselves to it very well after a time.

The teacher who cannot discuss sex in mixed company without blushing to the roots of his or her hair, who becomes angry if reference is made to the subject, or who feels extremely awkward as soon as the subject is raised, should on no account assume any responsibility in connection with sex education. On the other hand, the new, the unfamiliar, often appears in prospect much more difficult than it is on closer acquaintance. Many teachers who were hesitant to undertake sex education when the subject first came to the fore have, since then, engaged in a good deal of discussion and reading of the subject. They have found themselves gradually becoming less diffident. After a time, they have engaged in some activities connected with actual sex education, either giving instruction or else dealing with children's individual problems. Each step has brought an increase in confidence. Eventually, they have discovered that there was no fundamental reason why they should not accept such responsibility.

It used to be assumed that sex education could only be satisfactorily dealt with by doctors, or married teachers. But when doctors visit a school to lecture on the subject there is a special session for the purpose. It is quite an "occasion." The spot-light is directed upon sex, which is the last thing to be desired. Far better to let the right attitude towards sex be acquired, step by step, easily and smoothly, in the course of the school's general activities, than to call a meeting on the subject!

As for married teachers, they are just as likely as single teachers to be victims of infantile traits where sex is concerned. The experience of marriage, to which so much importance is attached, may have carried them further along the wrong lines than they otherwise would have gone. It is the emotional make-up of the person that matters, not whether he or she is married or single. Emotional babies marry, as we have seen, and the mere fact that they have married does not lift them to emotional maturity.

Successful sex education depends not upon experience of the married state, but upon the kind of person the educator really is—how he or she reacts to sex and its problems. That is why the selection of those who undertake such work is of vital importance. If it is conducted along sound lines sex education in our schools can contribute towards the attainment of the free marriage. But it is not enough by itself.

The parent's part is exceptionally important. We must turn to a consideration of how the parent can best meet the responsibilities which, notwithstanding the growing measure of sex education in the schools, remain, and must always remain, with the parents. What follows, in the next chapter, is addressed primarily to parents. But it is important that the teacher who is interested in sex education should work in the same spirit, and along much the same general lines, as are recommended there.

CHAPTER XXI

HOW TO TELL A CHILD THE FACTS

ALL parents play an important part in the sex education of their children. They may not consciously do so. But inevitably their attitude towards the ordinary, everyday problems which exercise the minds of their children, especially during the years of infancy, contributes much to the children's attitude. In every sphere of human activity we find that adults succeed or fail less by what they do than by *what they are*. And adults are what they are largely, indeed mainly, because of the influences brought to bear upon them in a thousand different ways during infancy, and throughout the various stages of development.

Until comparatively recently it was customary for educationists and others to urge the importance of sex guidance at or about the stage of adolescence. Of course, the adolescent is likely to ask many questions; and he is entitled to expect clear, honest answers to them. But no greater error could be made than to assume that we can safely leave all sex instruction until the adolescent stage is reached. Adolescence is often accompanied by acute emotional embarrassment, and this may render it difficult, if not impossible, to impart instruction then. But there is another consideration which is even more important. No boy or girl reaches the adolescent stage without having been educated, in the true sense, and in a very large measure, as regards sex. The experience of life which has affected the adolescent's outlook upon sex may have been good or bad. Inevitably he will have formed certain conclusions.

There is no finer sex education for any child than to be born into a happy family and to spend his years of infancy in the warm, glowing atmosphere

of such a happy group. Fortunate indeed is the child whose parents are well-mated, who wanted the child from the outset, and who appreciate to the full the vital importance of his early years. No amount of sex education outside of the home can possibly yield such splendid results as spring naturally and inevitably from *a good start in life*. It is during infancy that the child's love-patterns are formed. If all that he sees and experiences guide him in the right direction then, the foundations will have been well and truly laid. Sex education during the years following the nursery period will be far less difficult than it is in the majority of cases.

A quite young child is quick to detect a lie, especially when it is told by a parent with whose every mood the child is familiar. When a child realises that any question relating to one particular subject inevitably brings an untruthful reply or an evasion, he naturally concludes that there must be something extremely unpleasant, shameful or dangerous about that subject. If children are to be helped to regard sex as something entirely natural, a part of themselves, and to realise as their knowledge grows that sexual activity is also natural, as natural as breathing, it is absolutely essential that parents should answer their children's questions regarding sex honestly and frankly, and in a matter-of-fact way.

Note that: *in a matter-of-fact way*. If we become nervous or excited, revealing in our looks or manner if not in our words, that here is the question we have been dreading, or the one we have been eagerly awaiting, the child will be quick to observe our reaction to his question. The ideal is to be able to talk to the child in a friendly manner, without turning a hair. It must be admitted that this is beyond the power of many parents. Often they are unable to talk about sex in a matter-of-fact manner to anybody; the very mention of the subject causes some people to become angry, others to feel exceedingly awkward, others to blush and feel ashamed, and still others to laugh.

Yet it is a parent's duty to attend to this matter if it is at all possible. Nobody else—doctor, teacher, clergyman, friend—can do it as well. Of course, there are cases where, owing to the faulty attitude to sex of both father and mother, it is desirable that someone else be entrusted with the task of enlightening the child. But this is a poor second-best, a bad though sometimes unavoidable substitute for that intimate, friendly exchange of confidences which often binds child and parent together, and serves many useful purposes.

There are a number of good books on human reproduction which can be given to children of suitable ages, and which serve a very useful purpose. But they ought not to take the place of the parent's frank talk to the child. Rather they should supplement it. Many a parent who feels capable only of answering a child's questions very briefly finds it a great help to be able to add: "Yes, and I've got a lovely little book for you which tells you all about that." It is a good plan to have a suitable book available. One which can be warmly recommended is *How a Baby is Born* (published by Routledge at three shillings). This book, which is very simply written and contains some pleasing pictures, is suitable for any child who is able to read.

One great difficulty which faces many parents to-day is that in the past they have told their children various fairy stories and so find it hard to tell the truth when they feel the truth should be told! I recall an amusing instance of this.

After reading some books on the subject, a lady who had told her seven-year-old that babies were found under gooseberry bushes came to the conclusion that it was her duty to tell the child the truth. When conditions appeared to be favourable, she approached the little girl and began: "Darling, I want to tell you something. You remember you asked me about babies, some time ago? Well . . . eh . . .?"

The embarrassment which always came over her whenever she thought about sex, let alone discuss it, caused her to stop. The child regarded her curiously for a moment, then said accusingly: "Mummy, you're very naughty, I know what you're going to say. You told me a fib about the babies. You said they were found under gooseberry bushes, and they're not. I know where they *really* come from. *The postman brings them in his sack.*"

This little girl was certain that this was the truth, for not only had a young friend of hers told her the postman story, but she had heard her friend's mother relate the same account! A friend of mine who is a school teacher once heard a heated argument proceeding among three little girls, one of whom stoutly stood by the gooseberry bush, while another supported the "Doctor and his black case," and the third, who had a particularly vivid imagination, and who apparently was given to exaggeration, triumphed by saying that the babies came from the basement of a well-known Oxford Street store. Not only had her mother informed her of this; she had seen the babies there, lots of them, with her very own eyes! Thus it appears that children sometimes tell untruths when discussing this subject, although it must be confessed that they never attain the imaginative heights which many parents scale in answering sex questions.

Undoubtedly one of the main difficulties confronting parents is lack of a suitable vocabulary. Some assistance in this regard may be of service to readers. But before passing to that, let us be quite certain that we are ready for the task of answering our children's sex questions. The first essential is that we should realise that there is nothing at all morbid in the child's asking such questions. When parents speak of "morbid curiosity," "nasty-mindedness," and so on, in connection with genuine requests from their children for enlightenment, they are simply displaying their reluctance to face up to their undeniable duty. This reluctance arises entirely from *their own* feelings of discomfort where anything to do with sex is involved. It is very important to recognise that.

If you keep saying that your little boy is not yet old enough to learn about sex, or that your little girl is better without knowledge of the subject, you are still far too influenced by the old "Hush! Hush!" attitude to sex. You must free yourself from it before you can talk about sex in a matter-of-fact manner even to your own children: It is true that none of us can, quickly and deliberately, free ourselves from all the influences of the past. That is one reason why sex education, or *re-education* as I prefer to call it, must take a good deal of time before it can bestow its full benefits. But we can be clear in our minds that our duty is to tell the children, and that any reluctance on our part to discharge this duty is attributed entirely to our own weakness, and not in any way to "unpleasant curiosity" or some other fancied fault in the children. Generally these terms are used as excuses by parents who, in their hearts, desire to evade their obligation.

It is simply cowardice which makes parents lie to their children as they so often do. It is cowardice which makes them deceive themselves into "Tommy's morbid curiosity" or "Mary's strange interest in sex" when they ought to have the courage to look facts straight in the face and say: "The truth is, I'm *afraid* to tell the child the truth."

Well, why be afraid? You do not mind your child knowing that cats have kittens. Why do you find it hard to explain just how kittens come into existence? It is simple enough to tell the child that hens lay eggs which eventually produce chickens. Yet kittens are like babies—they come from all kinds of mysterious places invented by frightened parents who cannot bear to describe how a cat carries a kitten inside its body, this reluctance being due to the fact, that, unlike chickens, the kittens have a history similar to that of babies.

We have to face the fact that there are some parents, as I have already indicated, who really cannot bring themselves to talk frankly and easily about sex. "I should choke in trying to get the words out!" I have heard such parents say. Where this is so, no guidance as to vocabulary is likely to prove of assistance. The obvious embarrassment of the parent will undo all the good which the same words spoken in a different manner might have done.

But, happily, most parents are able to face up to this duty when they realise how important it is that they should do so. Once they understand that as a result of their cowardice they will lose the opportunity to render the child a service which will stand him in good stead throughout life, most parents prepare to shoulder their responsibility. They should be keen to do so out of a desire to aid their child.

When such keenness is present, a child's question will be welcomed. Needless to say, not all parents will answer the same question in precisely the same way. Individual characteristics inevitably enter; so does the degree of confidence and intimacy which exists between parent and child. When the relationship is one of close friendship, the task is easier.

Once a child has asked a question about sex, he is not likely to be satisfied with a single answer. The subject is bound to crop up again. The child reflects on the information he has received. He observes various things in the world around him. Further questions are inevitable.

It is important to make the child feel that he is entirely free to ask whatever questions occur to him. If he feels that he may ask questions about this subject only as a last resort, he will grow up with the feeling that sex is unusual in some respect or other. It is the only thing about which he is not permitted to ask as many questions as he chooses. That fact will impress him. When a child is free to ask any questions he desires, he will usually want to know where babies come from before he reaches the age of seven. In cases where children do not ask this question until some years later, we can safely assume that something has occurred which has tended to stifle their natural curiosity.

Simple, plain facts are all that is usually necessary in the case of a five or six-year-old. The language used must, of course, be suited to the child's stage of development. But that applies to all our conversations with children. Care should be taken to keep strictly to the truth so that there will be nothing for the child to unlearn in later life, and no "discoveries" to be made which will shake his confidence in his parents. "Nothing but the truth!" is a sound motto here.

No single form of words will suit every case, but here is one way in which to tell a young child how babies come:

You are bigger now than you were last year, aren't you? That's because you have grown. People who want a baby have to grow it. Babies start to grow inside their mothers. First, there was only a tiny seed. It was ever so small—so small, in fact, you could not have seen it! That seed was inside your mummy, and it grew into you. Then you kept growing until you were big enough to come out of mummy. You could stand the cold then, and so did not need to stay tucked up warm inside mummy any more. So you were born. You came out.

That is about as clearly and simply as one can put it to a very young child. And does it not sound much better, when you come to consider it, robbed of all the terrors accumulated in your mind on the subject, and set down in cold print than the tales about an arrival in a doctor's bag, or in a postman's sack with the letters, or a sudden appearance under a gooseberry bush or in a store basement? As a matter of fact, this idea of "growing a baby" appeals very strongly to most young children; they see things growing up all around them—flowers, animals, friends, and are conscious of growth in themselves. They are deeply interested in things which grow. *They grow; babies grow. It all seems perfectly natural, as indeed it is.*

As the child grows older, and notices more and things more, his questions may go a little deeper. For instance, he may wonder why he started to "grow" inside his mother. The parent who has dealt with the earlier questions along lines more or less similar to those outlined above, is unlikely to experience any difficulty in answering the further inquiries.

I told you before that you grew from a tiny seed. Flowers grow up from little seeds, too. But you are wondering how the seed got inside mother. Well, just as we have to plant seeds in the garden if we want to grow flowers there, so we have to plant a seed inside mother if we want to grow a baby.

There are some seeds inside her already, but a seed has to be planted so that it can join these other seeds. The baby needs somewhere warm and very comfortable so that it can grow when it is very young. The mother has a warm place inside her, like a little nest or cradle. The father has to put his seed into the mother so that his seed and hers can join together into one seed. Babies all have fathers and mothers, so do flowers and animals. It is from the seed which comes partly from the father and partly from the mother that the baby grows.

Further awkward questions are inevitable later. Eventually, the child will probably ask a question which can be fully and frankly answered only by describing the sex act. This, of course, is the stage which many parents dread. They feel that they can deal with any of the previous questions. But they fear—that is the word!—having to go into the process of sexual congress.

Many a parent who has answered, briefly but clearly, all earlier questions asked by the child, is dismayed when this inevitable question comes. Some evade it. In this way they may undo most of the good their earlier answers have achieved. "I've explained all that you really need to know," they may say, "and when you are older you will learn a great deal more. You know all that matters. Be content with that."

This must seem very strange to the child. All questions as to how babies came have been answered without hesitation. Other little boys and girls had

not found out all the interesting things about the seed, and the cradle inside mummy, and all the rest. Yet this question, which seems so obviously to arise out of the answers to the earlier ones, must not be asked. It may not be answered. "Why not?" asks the naturally inquiring mind of the child.

The child realises that unwittingly he has begun to cross into forbidden territory. He thinks about it all the more. "Why all this mystery? What lies behind it? Mother won't tell me. Father won't tell me. *I must find out somehow!*"

Far better to continue the policy of absolute frankness. But here, since sexual union has to be explained, the parent may wonder how to indicate certain organs of the body, whether to call them by their correct names or choose some suitable substitute expressions. In the case of a very young child "nest" or "cradle" for womb unquestionably was a gain. But it is not so very easy when dealing with sexual congress. There is much to be said for the methods advocated by Dr. Macdonald Ladell in his little volume *The Parents' Problem* (The Psychologist, Southampton Street, W.C.2), an inexpensive guide which parents will find both interesting and helpful.

He believes that children should be informed of the correct names of their reproductive organs. It is difficult to see any objection to this course. As the female genitals are less conspicuous than the male sexual organs, he suggests that the term "vulva" be used. This is the correct term for the lips which hide the opening into the vagina. In concluding his suggested explanation to a young child of how he was born, Dr. Macdonald Ladell says: "You grew there for nine months, and then you came out through the opening which girls have in front, called the vulva."

His suggested method of explaining sexual union is as follows:

"When you love anyone, you like to be near them as much as possible, and you like to kiss them. When a boy is grown up and he loves a grown-up girl, they get married, which means that they can live in the same house and sleep together.

"Then, at times, because they love each other very much, they get as close to each other as possible, and when the male penis is inside the female vulva in the place which is made for it, the seed passes from the male into the female.

"Coming close together like that does not hurt. It gives them both a delicious feeling, so that a husband and wife who love each other do it quite often, as it does not make a baby every time."

That is put forward as *one* way, not the only way, in which this explanation can be given. It is not intended as a model to be copied exactly, but as a helpful guide. It covers the whole ground in few words and so should help those parents who cannot see how to deal with this question without lengthy explanations of an embarrassing character.

It will be observed that in Dr. Macdonald Ladell's explanation of coitus above, he does not avoid, as some try to, all reference to the pleasurable aspect of sexual union. On the contrary, he stresses it. This is very important. If we are to encourage children to endeavour to live clean lives, in spite of temptations, we need to point to marriage as something which is beautiful and also pleasurable. The irritations associated with marriage receive far too much attention. Children hear the disparaging comments of adults, listen to jokes about marriage on the radio, and when they visit the theatre or music hall find that most of the loud laughs are at the expense of marriage or its "victims."

We need to stress, much more than we do, the benefits which marriage can bestow, among which must be included the pleasurable activity which the shared sex life affords. This is part of the truth which we must tell our children. In doing so not only shall we aid them to a sounder adjustment to that part of life which is called Sex. We shall contribute towards the attainment of Free Marriage.

The wise parent must look ahead. A child's questions to-day must not be answered merely with an eye upon to-day's needs. The future beckons, with all its glorious possibilities. Truth told by the parent to the child is one of the most effective means of ensuring that our children will build better than we have done, even when constructing the House of Marriage.

CHAPTER XXII

THE FAMILY AS A SOCIAL UNIT

THERE seems little doubt that the family was the primary social unit. Tribes and clans evolved through the expansion of the family to include other families in a wider unit. Sometimes this was due to cohesion—the descendants of a family keeping together in a group. Sometimes it was due to adhesion—the coming together of various family groups.

The evolution of sex and parental care yielded a grouping which consisted of two parents, male and female, and their children, and it is this grouping which we call the family. Undoubtedly, the family possesses biological significance; it has, indeed, been described as a "biological invention." Not only among human beings, but throughout the animal kingdom, we find parents caring for their offspring until the young reach a degree of development which enables them to fend for themselves.

But while the family is a biological device throughout the animal kingdom, meeting the needs of the young for protection, comfort, food, and guidance at the hands of adults of their own kind, marriage is essentially a social institution. There would be families even if there were no marriage—a point which is often overlooked in discussions of basic human relationships.

Family groupings existed long before marriage. The latter developed inevitably out of the former, as the need to regulate the relationship between the members of the family became apparent. It was necessary for society to draw up rules and regulations in order to protect itself against those members of the community who might feel inclined to disregard certain obligations. What had previously been the attitude of the majority, the acts and outlook which personal inclination and family feeling had prompted, became duties.

It is necessary to realise clearly this distinction between the family as a biological invention, and marriage as a social institution. We may change marriage as the result of legislation or of altered social customs. But the family remains, though marriage may have been changed beyond recognition. We may even decide to abolish marriage. The family would still exist. Wherever there are parents and offspring there is a family, an inescapable biological unity which cannot be ignored.

During the second great war with Germany, when men were conscripted for the Services and women were "directed" to work in factories or offices, there were those who protested that Britain's families were being "broken up." The expression served in a rough and ready way to indicate that the members of families were often scattered over the world, with the result that normal family life was rendered impossible. But the family is something which no Minister of Labour can break up. It is there, outside of the area which legislation or departmental orders can affect. An Act of Parliament abolishing the family would make no difference.

We are therefore faced with the fact that so long as children are born there will be families. It will help us to fashion our post-war world along sound lines if we keep that well in our minds. For while the state cannot destroy the family, it can do much to strengthen its influence in the national life, or, if it chooses, to weaken its power.

For example, we know that every great war is followed by large numbers of divorces. Suppose that the state decided to grant greatly increased facilities for divorce. This might not of itself gravely interfere with marriage as an institution, for at least half of those who obtain divorces re-marry, and it is probable that a higher proportion than this would do so during the five or ten years following a great war, when many divorces could be attributed to exceptional war-time conditions. But although marriage as an institution might not suffer thereby, a blow would have been struck at the *usefulness* of the family. The childless couples who had been divorced could re-marry, or they could remain "single." Where, however, there were children, there would be withdrawal in many cases of parental care, and one of the main benefits which the family normally bestows upon children would thus be lost.

There can be little doubt that the rise of industrialism resulted in a considerable decrease in parental authority. There was a move away from the settled communal life of the countryside, to towns which grew bigger and bigger, and in which housing conditions were often far from satisfactory. The family as an economic unit was affected in many ways. Changes in employment prospects, or the movement of factories from one place to another, resulted in large numbers of people having to move quickly to strange places, where they knew nobody and had, as we say, "no roots." Opportunities for women to enter industry increased, and mothers were often engaged in gainful occupation whilst their children sought relaxation in city streets.

Attempts which were made to safeguard children or to remedy some of the worst effects of the new order of industrialism tended to weaken parental responsibility and to place more power, over the lives of both adults and children, in the hands of the state. More recently, the state has taken over popular education from the parents and the churches, and still more recently there has been a great extension of feeding arrangements in schools. To-day a very large number of parents have little responsibility left to them apart from conception and pregnancy.

"Whether or not the replacement of parents by bureaucrats is a good thing must be determined by reference to the quality of the care given to the young by the two parties," writes Professor F. A. E. Crew. "It is possibly true that the electric incubator and brooder are, from the point of view of the chicken, better than the mother hen. It is not true, however, that as yet at least, the

incubator is as good as the mammalian mother's womb, or that any satisfactory substitute has yet been found for the affectionate devotion of a human mother for her own baby: no foundling institution, no matter how scientific in management, has yet been designed that can equal, in respect of the moral and emotional development of children, the home, even though this does not lack a certain squalor. This is not to say that any parents and any home are better than such an institution: this is certainly not the case. There are great numbers of married couples who are demonstrably totally unfitted to have the care of their own children. In a modern industrialised society there is a great need for the education of potential parents in their responsibilities and duties, for a knowledge of the techniques of raising offspring is not instinctive in us; it is an acquisition to be obtained only through serious study."

Professor Crew also points out that the emancipation of women will probably be further enlarged, and that many alternatives to marriage and motherhood may be discovered. It is possible that divorce may become more free and that changes may be made in the institution of marriage. But whatever changes may take place, he believes that "it would seem to be most desirable that the family grouping in some form or other should persist."

The family is always with us, even though it be scattered. In the years that lie ahead, the question of whether the old family grouping should be retained and encouraged, or be broken up or at any rate discouraged, will assume great importance. Some of the more extreme measures advocated in order to ensure the full employment of our people take little or no account of the unity of the family. If it be true, as some maintain, that in a war-impooverished world Britain will need the work of every pair of hands available, whether male or female, and that workers must be directed to whatever districts need labour, a totalitarian regime, with all its disregard of family ties, will overthrow not merely the existing economic order, but will strike at the very roots from which have sprung all the most cherished characteristics of our people—the family. For Britain's greatness has been built primarily in the homes of its people, and those homes have housed not merely individuals and furniture, but families and a spirit of family unity.

The choice which lies ahead is one between what Lord Elton has called "a Whipsnade World" and one in which the full power of the state is employed to encourage the maintenance of the family-grouping. The demands of the post-war years will unquestionably be stern. The call to sacrifice that which in the past has seemed to be essential is certain to be heard. In days when we must plan or perish there is a danger of planning being carried to an extreme where it becomes planning for planning's sake instead of planning for people's sake. Wherever that occurs, the family grouping is threatened.

"Mobility" is a word which has a pleasant sound for the planner who disregards human values and sees men and women merely as pawns on a vast economic chess-board. The benefits which are associated with mobility of labour sometimes appear very attractive when considered in terms of wages and opportunities for advancement. Even so, the resettlement of large numbers of workers, the uprooting of half a town in order to remove work-people to a fresh field of labour, is often linked with appalling human tragedies. Some must remain behind; their work is different from that of other members of the family. They find themselves cut off from the family grouping, and the

family influence is weakened accordingly. Yet the desire to be together may become stronger as the days pass. Much of the ill-health and bad work in our war factories was attributable to psychological factors which could be summed up in a single phrase: *Longing for home*. The same workers, who had been directed to leave their homes to work in distant areas, would have been far happier and healthier at work near their homes, even though the work-place might have been much less cheerful than the distant factory. The splendid canteens, welfare provision of every kind, and ideal working conditions which characterised many of our great arms works during the war were as nothing compared with home, and all that it meant, to nine-tenths of the workers.

It is abundantly plain that only the strongest determination to restore family life, expressed in resolute state action, can slowly recover some of the ground which has been lost during the war. The official evacuation scheme at the start of the war was intended to embrace some three million people; actually, when the bombing became serious, some 1,230,000 took advantage of the facilities officially provided. Later, when the flying bombs began to explode in London and the nearby areas, a further 818,000 people were sent away. Over and above these a large number of people left the danger areas voluntarily. Often, complete families could not move. The children, and sometimes the elderly, were sent to places of safety, while the breadwinners remained behind. Thirty camps were opened for handicapped children—mental defectives, the deaf, cripples, and others who could not reasonably be billeted in the reception areas.

How strong was the urge to family reunion, however, in spite of all the dangers at home can be seen when although officially discouraged from doing so, large numbers of "evacuees" trickled back whenever there was a lull in the bombing. Even when flying bombs and rockets were still dropping on London, the trains were bringing back considerable numbers of people of all ages. Those who remained outside of the danger areas for lengthy periods found, in many cases, that the trials of separation were not the only ills arising from the interference with the continuity of family life. Sometimes they had almost forgotten their parents.

The family, the war's first casualty, suffered in other ways as well. Bombs killed many parents who remained in the target towns, and by the end of the war no fewer than 80,000 children were being brought up in 1,400 institutions, either voluntary or public. Not all of these were war orphans, for some had been deprived of normal family life by causes other than war; but, as Lady Allen of Hurtwood expressed it, some of these children were "isolated from the main stream of life and education, and few of them knew the comfort and security of individual affection." These wards of the community should be constantly the concern of our legislators and local authorities. Following a number of sensational disclosures regarding lack of adequate supervision of such homes, a Committee of Inquiry was set up by the Government to investigate conditions obtaining in all types of homes for children.

There can be little doubt that, although many of these homes are performing excellent service, there is ample room for improvement in some of them. Moreover, other forms of provision for such children, including adoption under suitable safeguards, might in some cases represent an improvement upon even the best of institutions. The Nuffield Trust is investigating the whole

problem. There is widespread interest in a subject which must on no account be allowed to slip back out of the public mind under the pressure of the strenuous days that lie ahead.

Closely linked with all other efforts designed to facilitate family resettlement is the provision of adequate housing accommodation. The number of houses required to meet the full requirements of the population has been variously estimated, but it appears to be agreed that something approaching five million must be built as quickly as possible. Inevitably the cry is for "Houses first!" Yet although shelter is obviously the first essential, it is only a bare requirement. More than houses are needed to ensure a happy community life. Side by side with the millions of houses we need shops, churches, cinemas, sports grounds, and, particularly, community centres.

The reconstitution of family life after the war ought to be a primary object of any government. Reference has already been made to the evils associated with "mobility," and it is worth stressing that these were marked even before the war emphasised them in a hundred ways. A report on "The Church and the Planning of Britain," presented by the Social and Industrial Commission of the Church of England, draws attention to the fact that large business establishments, multiple shops, banks and other organisations move their employees from place to place. Where individuals really settle down nowhere, where they have no real attachments, family life suffers to some extent, while in extreme cases normal family life is impossible. Moreover, the mental and spiritual outlook is undoubtedly affected by the lack of roots, as is the attitude to such matters as local government. We are a nation of families, yet family life becomes increasingly more difficult to maintain. The period of transition from a war-time economy to a peace-time production basis will undoubtedly produce many problems affecting the family. It is very desirable, therefore, that there should be a strong realisation of the vital importance of restoring and strengthening the family grouping.

Lord Elton has said: "The end in view is to restore a land in which families can live together in happiness and contentment, and in a sense of security." Talk of "Human Budgets" which take regard only of the nation's man and woman-power may prove misleading. Rather should we regard the family as the true social unit, knowing that every effort which strengthens family life enriches the nation.

CHAPTER XXIII

GROW OLD GRATEFULLY!

CAN you afford to die? Some people cannot. They know that if they die their partner in marriage will be unprovided for financially, or otherwise. This terror of old age may be due to lack of reasonable provision for the future during earlier days. And *most* of the evils associated with old age are due to failure to prepare for the inevitable.

For it is inevitable that we should grow old in years. That we should weaken mentally as well as physically with the coming of advanced years is

not inevitable. It depends upon whether we have been content to "vegetate" for years on end. The human vegetables are those who cease striving to create. Self-expression which finds an outlet in creative activity, even if in some quite trifling sphere, is vitally important to us throughout the years. But we suffer most from its absence or presence when we are old.

We all know that some people are "old" at forty. Others are "young" at seventy. In order to understand these differences we must realise that all of us have three "ages." There is our age in years, which usually is regarded as much more important than it really is. There is our bodily age, which may not by any means be the same as the physical average for our years. And there is our mental age, which is perhaps the most important of the three.

Throughout this book I have stressed that marriage is what you make it. Now, I maintain that—to a great extent at any rate—*old age is what you make it*. But much of the making occurs in earlier life. You reap what you have sown. And as special difficulties often face married people when they grow old, it is as well to consider how happiness may be achieved in old age for individuals and for married lovers.

I have known women of fifty who have been as vigorous physically, and more alert mentally, than many of little more than half that age. I have met old men whose mental grip and physical energy alike have been far superior to the intellectual and bodily powers of much younger men. Age-limits, imposed where appointments are concerned, are often grossly unfair to people who physically and mentally are younger than their years.

A United States Government Report, following an investigation into the position of the elderly in the labour market, said: "Older workers are handicapped in three ways: by to-day's general unemployment, by the prejudices of employers, and by their own fears." Not a word about their age, mark you! Indeed, the report adds: "There is no evidence to support a general prejudice against older workers."

The whole art of facing birthdays without fear is to keep happily engaged. Middle-aged people have lived in this world long enough to have suffered many "downs" as well as "ups." Emotional strain, anxiety connected not only with themselves but, often, with their children, who may be launching out into the world and getting married or divorced, and a host of other things, increase the feeling of tension. The memories of past illnesses and other troubles help to strengthen anxiety as the years slip by. "I'm getting old!" soon becomes their explanation for everything unpleasant.

No one can avoid old age. But the *kind* of old age which awaits you is to a large extent in your own hands. You can, to a degree, choose your pattern and work it out for yourself. Not many do, of course. Most approach old age, and indeed, life at all ages, in the most haphazard manner imaginable. But a certain amount of wise planning is always an aid to right living. The phantom worries about "old age creeping on," with which so many middle-aged people busy themselves, are often based upon troubles which would strain and perplex people of any age, and which have nothing whatever to do with age. It is worth bearing that in mind.

You must make your own design for old age. If, during middle life, the claims of business or of running a home occupy much of your attention, take great care that they do not cause you to relinquish all social interests and

outside activities. Many people, especially when they no longer are able to compete with the young, excuse themselves from interests outside of their business or family circle by saying that they lack talent, have not the time, or feel no inclination for such things. Sometimes they point out that there are so many experts in any game or activity that they cannot hope to compete successfully.

But it is not necessary to play like a great musician in order to gain pleasure and profit, in the best sense, from music. It is not necessary to paint like a genius in order to enjoy art in some form or other. You need not be very good at a hobby to have that hobby to do *you* a world of good. The vital point to note is that, just as you make financial provision for old age by saving, or by taking out an endowment policy, it is equally necessary to *insure against boredom*. If you do not cultivate interests outside of work or family, you will suffer when you are retired from business or freed from family cares.

It has been said that no one with a good hobby is lonely for long. A hobby provides a bridge between you and others. Why, the happiest old men in the world are to be found on bowling greens, and happy indeed is the woman whose late years are spent in some interesting pursuit, whether artistic or taking the form of service to others.

What has been called "perfectionism"—unwillingness to play unless assured of triumph—is a childish trait, a mark of immaturity. And it is responsible for countless failures in life. "All or nothing!" it demands. "100 per cent guaranteed, or I'll not make the effort."

With this attitude often goes a pathetic desire to maintain all the advantages associated with youth. Instead of accepting certain changes which the passage of the years makes inevitable, the immature in outlook and emotional development cling tenaciously to what suited them well twenty or more years before, but is hopelessly out of place now. Thus you see the elderly man trying to compete with the younger at tennis; the woman of sixty torturing her body to appear young, the elderly of both sexes seeking to prove their youth by sexual "affairs." The desire to be young at all costs, when one is no longer young, is part of the said insistence upon "all or nothing." "I'd rather die than lose my youthful powers" is the foolish attitude of many.

If you would plan for a happy old age, the best time to begin is in youth. You may amend mistakes later, but that is the ideal time to begin. All the glorious adventure of life, what may be read in books and in nature and in the men and women all round; everything that adds zest to life; everything that broadens the outlook and widens the interests—all contribute towards the strengthening of the real *you* with whom you must live in the late years. "The last of life is the goal of youth."

Nowadays, more people live to a ripe old age. It is particularly necessary, then, that we should know how the "art of growing old gracefully" may be achieved. You do nothing gracefully if you struggle against it, and are forced against your will to accept it. And to grow old gracefully, which is the only way to grow old happily, you have to accept cheerfully the fact that men and women *do* grow old, *do* pass out of this world. Acceptance is the first essential for adaptation to this stage of life—or to any other, for that matter.

Old age is the time when the past is reviewed. It is no use telling a man of

seventy that there may be many years of life ahead for him. He will tend to look back. He knows that the greater part of his life lies behind him. Happy is the man or woman who has much that is pleasant to look back upon! We gain by deliberately creating the substance of such pleasant memories at every stage of our journey.

I knew a woman who for years had said that she would keep working hard at her profession until she was nearly seventy, and then would travel. Her father and mother had worked hard until they reached that age, and had remained extremely fit and fully capable of travelling a good deal and enjoying it to the full. But their daughter was injured in a car accident and suffered injuries which quite ruled out extensive travel for her. None of us know what life holds ahead. Wars, accidents, and changes of fortune can render it impossible for us to carry out plans which have been in our minds for years. Postponement of cherished schemes is a great mistake.

Some promise themselves that they will take up a hobby later on. Others say that when they have saved such-and-such a sum of money they will go on a world cruise. Young people get the idea into their heads that 30 and 35 is a good age at which to marry, and so promise themselves that they will marry about that age. Single persons say that when they marry and settle down they will do some serious reading, or take a course of study. This "*deferred living*" is dangerous.

People who postpone all sorts of things they would like to do, or which they feel they ought to do, are putting off life itself. They are not using all their powers. They are remaining content with a development far less than that of which they are capable. And in most cases the putting off of desirable things becomes a habit. Moreover, not only do events which cannot be foreseen often prevent the aims being realised, but in many cases the former goal ceases to attract with the passing of the years.

Do the thing you want to do while you feel like doing it. If not carried to foolish extremes, that is sound advice. It means that you will live your life to the full, according to your inclinations and opportunities. You will fill your years with living instead of mere dreaming, will taste experience instead of feeding upon anticipation.

Yes, and it means that you will keep alive a certain curiosity which is important, and which makes life interesting. It means that you will not lose the feeling of adventure which is so vital to happiness. Though you may never travel far, nor do anything spectacular, you must at least *take a chance* once in a while instead of constantly playing for safety. The human vegetable adopts "Safety First!" as his motto in everything. He drifts with the stream of life instead of helping to steer his own course. Those who plan and steer enjoy experiences which add to the store of happy memories which can be called upon in late life.

A whole book might be written about men and women who performed astonishing feats late in life. Many great books were written, and operas composed, by people over eighty. After passing the milestone of three-score-years and ten, many actually have undertaken totally new work and succeeded in it. But a list of impressive achievements by well-known men and women would hardly interest most readers of this book. "I am not a genius," they would say, and leave it at that.

Still, here is one striking case which is worth recording, since it concerns someone whose name probably is unknown to most of you—Dr. Lilian Martin of San Francisco. A Professor of Psychology at Stanford University, she was automatically retired on reaching the age-limit of 65. Possibly because she was a psychologist, she knew the importance of activity, mental or otherwise, in late years. So she started a clinic—the first child guidance clinic in the United States. When she was over 70 she established another clinic—this one to help people over 65 to adjust themselves to “old age.”

What holds many elderly people back from attempting things once they have passed 70 is the *knowledge* of their years. If you say: “I’m too old to achieve things,” then of course you will have convinced yourself that hardly any activity is worth the attempt. The elderly people who “keep young” and surprise all their friends by their useful and interesting activities are invariably those who regard their years as a challenge. They are determined not to be beaten, within the limits imposed by common sense, of course.

The great essential to bear in mind is that the light of life is never extinguished. That mysterious thing so vaguely called “life” is charged with responsibility for people’s misfortunes, or linked with “luck” when things go well. Actually, it is more like a relay race. Each generation takes over in its turn. Each receives something from those who have completed their run. Each leaves something as he departs. The torch of life is passed on, and we, if we are wise, can see as we grow older the young hands preparing to grasp it—and we can rejoice that what they will soon grasp is not a dim flicker, but a bright, shining, glorious thing. Life goes on. The stream is continuous. *And we live on in it.*

Thus as we grow older we tend to live more and more through others. Our own lives find expression in this way, and, if we are wise, we know that nothing is lost. We know that we can enrich the stream of life. This enrichment is seen at its best in the happy marriage which has been blessed with children.

The parents project part of their lives into the lives of their children. Here, of course, there is an element of danger—the process can easily be carried too far, with undue direction taking the place which influence rightfully should occupy. That is why parents need to be as objective as possible in the upbringing of children. The aim must not be to make our children little copies of ourselves. They can do better than that! But the best in us may well influence them and enable them to build better than they otherwise would. A sense of individual freedom within the framework of the home, a feeling of personal responsibility arising from that very freedom, a pleasant feeling of security, there you have the pattern of the happy home which enriches the lives of all within it, the family which draws its strength from the members, and, in turn, imparts strength to each one, with interest added.

As we grow older we need the family. Even though its members are spread all over the world, the sense of fellowship is important. While it is there, we are never really alone. It can sustain and help us. Childhood and old age are the periods in our lives when the family’s value is most marked. And there are other assets which, always important, increase in value as the years pass. An interest which makes one forget self is one, as we have seen. Others are a sense of humour, health and tolerance, and sympathetic understanding.

In marriage, where two people have shared the experiences of the years, have passed through sorrows as well as joys, defeats as well as triumphs, there is often a fine sense of calm and quiet in old age. With so much shared to look back upon, the lovers grow old *gratefully*. Instead of regrets for what was missed in youth, fretfulness for what has gone, there is a sense of completion, of satisfaction which comes from the knowledge that life has been lived to the full. Fullness of life leaves no room for regrets. Shared, it yields gratitude for all the richness which life together has brought.

Love is the essential of the whole of married life. Lovers who have grown old together know from experience that it is not merely the starting-point of marriage, but *its end*.

THE END

